

Beyond the Battlefield: Institutional Army Transformation Following Victory in Iraq

by

Lieutenant Colonel G. Scott Taylor
United States Army



United States Army War College
Class of 2012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution is Unlimited

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<small>Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</small>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 08-03-2012		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Beyond the Battlefield: Institutional Army Transformation Following Victory in Iraq				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel G. Scott Taylor				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Jody Petery US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution: A					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT The Army goes to great lengths to capture lessons learned and preserve these lessons for current practitioners and future generations. Though the Army is one of the most self-critical organizations found in American society, a well-deserved reputation has also been earned for failing to inculcate those lessons by transforming the institutional Army. Change is achieved through a continuous cycle of adaptive innovation, experimentation, and experience. In Iraq, out of necessity while in contact with a dynamic enemy, the Army transformed on the battlefield with radical changes in doctrine, organization, training, and materiel, which significantly enabled battlefield success. As troops withdraw from Iraq at the end of 2011, this paper analyzes the success of the military's counterinsurgency strategy and nation-building efforts, examines the future of combat which the Army may face in order to recommend a suitable force posture, and makes recommendations for future competencies and capabilities utilizing the problem-solving construct of DOTMLPF in order to ensure future victories in this relevant component of the full spectrum of conflict.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Counterinsurgency, Instruments of National Power, Stability Operations, Doctrine, Organization, Training, Material, Leadership and Education, Personnel, Facilities, DOTMLPF, Iraq					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)
			UNLIMITED	64	

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**BEYOND THE BATTLEFIELD: INSTITUTIONAL ARMY TRANSFORMATION
FOLLOWING VICTORY IN IRAQ**

by

Lieutenant Colonel G. Scott Taylor
United States Army

Colonel Jody Petery
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel G. Scott Taylor

TITLE: Beyond the Battlefield: Institutional Army Transformation Following Victory in Iraq

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 08 March 2012 **WORD COUNT:** 14,006 **PAGES:** 64

KEY TERMS: Counterinsurgency, Instruments of National Power, Stability Operations, Doctrine, Organization, Training, Material, Leadership and Education, Personnel, Facilities, DOTMLPF, Iraq

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The Army goes to great lengths to capture lessons learned and preserve these lessons for current practitioners and future generations. Though the Army is one of the most self-critical organizations found in American society, a well-deserved reputation has also been earned for failing to inculcate those lessons by transforming the institutional Army. Change is achieved through a continuous cycle of adaptive innovation, experimentation, and experience. In Iraq, out of necessity while in contact with a dynamic enemy, the Army transformed on the battlefield with radical changes in doctrine, organization, training, and materiel, which significantly enabled battlefield success. As troops withdraw from Iraq at the end of 2011, this paper analyzes the success of the military's counterinsurgency strategy and nation-building efforts, examines the future of combat which the Army may face in order to recommend a suitable force posture, and makes recommendations for future competencies and capabilities utilizing the problem-solving construct of DOTMLPF in order to ensure future victories in this relevant component of the full spectrum of conflict.

BEYOND THE BATTLEFIELD: INSTITUTIONAL ARMY TRANSFORMATION FOLLOWING VICTORY IN IRAQ

Following its successful execution of counterinsurgency strategy and nation-building in Iraq, the U.S. Armed Forces have valuable lessons to capture and apply to the institutional army in order to enable victory in similar future conflicts. The U.S. military, particularly the general purpose forces, historically has paid scant attention to stability operations and counterinsurgency strategy, often viewing these as beyond the scope of their primary responsibilities, a less desirable form of conflict or a lesser included subset of major conventional warfare. The military's experience and unique challenges in Iraq reveals otherwise. Operation Iraqi Freedom demonstrated that stability operations, by its nature, are complex, messy, require significant resolve and adaptability and necessitate a whole of government approach to leverage all of the instruments of national power toward the common goal. Adhering to the aphorism that those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it, this paper first assesses the probability that the Army will face a counterinsurgency and requirement for nation-building again in the future and based on this assessment, discusses the four prevalent schools of thought on the appropriate force posture for the Army. Second, this paper highlights the shift to counterinsurgency strategy and the primary conclusions to be garnered from these successes, with particular emphasis on the importance of applying all of the instruments of national power to attack the root causes of the insurgency and bolster governmental legitimacy. Finally, accepting that one cannot rule out stability operations as a probable and difficult form of conflict in the future, this paper makes recommendations for taking the next step to institutionalize lessons learned from the

Iraqi experience by transforming the institutional Army, along the problem-solving construct of DOTMLPF (Doctrine, Organizations, Training, Material, Leadership and Education, Personnel, and Facilities), in order to ensure that stability operations and counterinsurgency warfare retain their rightful place in the full spectrum of conflict and that the Army remains ready and trained to defend the nation and its interests as directed by the national command authority.

Army Adaptation

Recognizing that as a learning organization, the Army must critically analyze the lessons from its successes and failures in Iraq, the Army has undergone significant reviews and analyses over the last few years. With the objective of ensuring that the hard-earned lessons of the battlefield in Iraq are not lost, the Army must determine how these lessons inform change in the institutional Army. Unconventional warfare in the form of counterinsurgencies, terrorism and guerilla warfare is here to stay and nostalgia for simpler forms of conventional war will not place the Army in the best position for what will most likely be the next conflict.¹ As military professionals, one must look to the future and properly assess the emerging character of war. As Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said in a speech to the Corps of Cadets at West Point, New York, “We can’t know with absolute certainty what the future of warfare will hold, but we do know it will be exceedingly complex, unpredictable, and unstructured.”²

Currently, few, if any, potential peer competitors exist in the world which can match the U.S. Army conventionally on the battlefield; furthermore, the rise of a peer competitor in land warfare remains unlikely in the next couple of decades. Just as the Army draws lessons learned from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, so do America’s adversaries. The key admonition from the 100-hour war in Desert Storm and the initial

ground invasion in Iraq in 2003 is that no one can match the U.S. Army in a conventional ground war. The technological overmatch combined with lightning fast tactics and proficiency in maneuver warfare, complemented by responsive and overwhelming air power, leaves virtually any antagonist considering a conventional war with the United States in doubt as to their chances of victory. The type of long wars seen in Iraq and Afghanistan over the last decade have, however, taught America's adversaries that the U.S. can be challenged and potentially defeated in what Mao Tse-Tung dubbed "protracted warfare". The American people do not have patience for long wars. Indeed, the endurance that the United States has shown over the last decade is very atypical of the American record in support for wars and is unlikely to be repeated in the future. Consequently, warfare in the future is far more likely to be irregular.³

Enemies will seek to match strength against weakness and will try to draw the United States into a protracted war they know the American people are less likely to support and that the current military structure and institutions are less prepared to dominate.

The Army's remarkable adaptation to conduct counterinsurgency campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan over the last several years has successfully pulled victory from the jaws of defeat.⁴ As the Secretary of Defense aptly stated, "the Army's ability to learn and adapt in recent years allowed us to pull Iraq from the brink of chaos in 2007, and over the past year, to roll back the Taliban from their strongholds in Afghanistan."⁵ The wealth of experience and the lessons of conducting stability operations and successful counterinsurgency strategy in these two countries have embedded in the Army's collective psyche the skills necessary to master this difficult form of warfare. As the Army withdraws all major combat troops from Iraq at the end of 2011, declaring success

and turning over the fight to capable and well-trained Iraqi Security Forces (ISF), the Army must analyze its successes and failures and draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the campaign.⁶ The adaptation on the ground in Iraq against a dynamic threat succeeded but required the use of all of the elements of national power, something that required great effort and adaptation for the Army on the ground to fully embrace.

In the introduction to his paper on finding balance in U.S. military strategy, William Flavin cites two historical examples of successful adaptation by land forces in contact with an enemy they did not expect to fight: the British Army fighting the French and Indians in North America in the mid-18th century and the U.S. Army fighting the Viet-Cong and North Vietnamese Army in Vietnam in the late 1960s. In both cases, he praises the successful transformation of these armies in evolving their doctrine, tactics, training, organizations, and equipment to win tactically on the field of battle against an asymmetric enemy. However, the more pertinent lesson to be drawn from these historical examples is evident in how both of these Armies “driven by ideological, fiscal and political necessity”, reverted back to default standards of doctrine, organization, equipping and training its forces in the years following the conflicts.⁷

In order to codify recent, crucial adaptations, the Army must properly assess the lessons learned in the fights of the last decade, commit to maintain this full spectrum capability and ensure that appropriate changes in the institutional Army occur to avoid repeating the mistakes previously described. A necessary precursor to any effort to transform the institutional Army requires a determination of future threats, requirements and capabilities and what is economically feasible in an era of fiscal austerity.

The Four Schools of Thought on Posturing the Future Force

In an article published in *Armed Forces Journal*, Frank G. Hoffman outlined four competing schools of thought on the future of armed conflict and how the Army should be structured to handle that conflict.⁸ These schools of thought are pertinent to the discussion of how to transform the institutional Army because the anticipated operating environment should drive the requirements, capabilities sought and requisite adaptation.

Proponents of the first school of thought, dubbed the Counterinsurgents, believe that the fight the Army finds itself engaged in today in Iraq and Afghanistan, “represent(s) far more than a passing blip in the evolution of conflict...[and] contend that massed formations comprised of traditional arms and large-scale conflict between conventional powers is not a realistic planning scenario.”⁹ Counterinsurgents contend that the likely challenges of the future will be failed or failing states, transnational threats and radicalized extremists. Insightfully, advocates of this school of thought argue that the purpose of a military is not to “perpetuate preferred paradigms, [but instead]...to prepar[e] for likely contingencies and secur[e] America’s interests.”¹⁰ Counterinsurgents fear that much as the Army did following the Vietnam War, the Army will likely revert to the default position of preparing for major combat operations (MCO) to the exclusion of stability operations, or as it is now known, Stability, Security, Transition and Reconstruction operations (SSTR). Though possible, a return to an exclusive focus on major combat operations is improbable, at least in the near future, as there are stark differences between the aftermath of Vietnam and Iraq. First and foremost, most acknowledge that following the withdrawal of U.S. Forces from Vietnam, though having never suffered any major tactical defeats, the Army did leave defeated at the strategic level. Distraught over the loss of a hitherto undefeated record on the field of battle, the

Army sought to distance itself from the painful memories of Vietnam. Rationalizing the strategic defeat in Vietnam, Army leadership ostensibly attributed the loss to political causes and vowed to never fight a protracted insurgency war again, instead preferring to prepare its forces for more traditional, conventional warfare against peer competitors that presented existential threats to the United States.¹¹ There are many differences between the Army after the Vietnam War and the Army leaving Iraq, not the least of which is that the Army leaving Iraq has returned home confident in their tactical victory and to a lesser extent of strategic success of their mission in Iraq. Clearly, only time will tell whether the established representative democracy and stability in Iraq will last and history will have to judge whether the sacrifices were worth the costs. In the immediate aftermath of the war in Iraq, though, the perception is that the Operation Iraqi Freedom was a success. In addition, as suggested above, the U.S. Army faces no immediate peer competitor in conventional warfare who is likely to contest the U.S. Army on the field of battle. Though the sheer size and growing technological advancements of the Chinese Army could present a threat to U.S. forces, nuclear deterrence, strategic imbalance in naval and air forces and economic interdependence make the probability of such conflict improbable in the near future. Finally, though directives can change with the transition of political and military leadership, Department of Defense (DoD) Directive 3000.05 published on 28 November 2005, directs that

...stability operations are a core U.S. military mission that the Department of Defense shall be prepared to conduct and support” and that they shall be given priority comparable to combat operations and explicitly addressed....across all DoD activities including doctrine, organizations, training, education, exercises, materiel, leadership, personnel, facilities and planning.¹²

Having learned from the mistakes in the post-Vietnam era and wanting to ensure that the adaptation resulting from the lessons learned in Iraq and Afghanistan endures, SSTR operations have been elevated in joint and Army doctrine and planning to the same level as major combat operations.

Proponents of the second school of thought outlined by Frank Hoffman, called the Traditionalists, represent the other end of the spectrum of conflict. Traditionalists seek to “re-establish the traditional focus of the armed forces on fighting and winning the nation’s wars,” warning against restructuring or reorienting ground forces “away from their traditional emphasis on large-scale, industrial-age warfare against states or an alliance of states.”¹³ Traditionalists do not deny that irregular warfare occurs commonly in the modern era but they argue that these small wars do not represent an existential threat to the nation. They argue that armed forces prepared to fight major combat operations in large-scale industrial warfare can handle the challenges presented by counter-insurgency missions and fear that the “newfound embrace of messy, protracted counterinsurgencies” tends to degrade the combat skills of the nation’s land forces due to the high operations tempo of these long wars.¹⁴ To be sure, the Army’s core competencies in fighting conventional wars have eroded over the last decade.¹⁵ In truth, very few of the Majors and Sergeants First Class and below in the Army can remember, much less skillfully execute, combined arms maneuver integrating armor, infantry, aviation and artillery on the battlefield. The Army desperately needs an opportunity to return to these basics of conventional warfare in order to be prepared to match a conventional force on the field of battle. However, merely focusing on conventional fights and wishing away the types of wars the Army does not want to fight -

the messy and protracted counterinsurgency fights - is potentially naïve and irresponsible. First and foremost, the historical record shows that America's political leaders will send the Army into harm's way whether prepared or not. Senior military leaders when facing budgetary and force reductions have testified before Congress on the need to be judicious when reducing the force, lest the nation be left with a hollow force, unprepared to meet the call when again sent to war.¹⁶ Likewise, as senior Army leaders have also asserted, the Chief of Staff of the Army does not have the luxury of telling the President of the United States that the Army cannot or will not accomplish a mission assigned when called. The Army must be prepared to accomplish any mission along the full spectrum of conflict. Second, as senior leaders of the Army, one has a moral obligation to the nation and to the Families of these great Soldiers to prepare them for the types of conflicts that the nation will face. At the outset of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, an unpreparedness to fight protracted stability operations and a desire to utilize conventional warfare strategy versus counterinsurgency strategy led to unnecessary deaths of countless Soldiers. Traditionalists argue that only conventional, large-scale wars can threaten the existence of the United States and that lesser forms of conflict along the full spectrum of operations are simpler, "lesser included cases that can be handled by a conventionally trained and structured force."¹⁷ Though there is some truth in this assertion, the lives lost while trying to relearn lessons of counterinsurgency warfare in a conventionally trained force are tragic, especially when integration of these lessons into the institutional Army following the current wars may have spared those lives. Finally, though arguments that only massed conventional forces can directly threaten the sovereignty of the United States appears at face value

to be true, this discounts the loss of prestige and influence that America would likely endure if it seeks to abstain from all small wars out of a desire to focus exclusively on domestic issues and only large-scale industrial war. As Clausewitz asserted centuries ago, war remains an extension of policy by other means. The Army must be prepared to respond when called on by the nation's political leaders. Failed states and transnational threats can directly threaten the stability of the country if those threats lead to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The capability to intervene in failing states or to put a stop to state-sponsored terrorism is necessary to provide for the territorial and economic security of the country. In addition, though rogue states and transnational actors are unlikely to pose an existential threat to the nation, their actions can drive the U.S. to a posture of isolationism or detachment from the world thus diminishing U.S. capacity to protect American interests abroad. The United States, as the world's leading superpower, provides much of the stability that secures the opportunities for commerce and peaceful international relations to solve differences. The Armed Forces must be prepared to intervene when called upon by the national command authority across the full spectrum of conflict in order to maintain the ability to influence national interests worldwide and to remain a relevant world leader.

The third and fourth schools of thought outlined by Frank Hoffman include the Utility Infielder and the Division of Labor schools. In both schools of thought, advocates recognize the need to be prepared for both conventional warfare and counterinsurgencies and advocate different ways to provide these capabilities. The Division of Labor proponents argue that because of the complexity and markedly different skill sets necessary to successfully prosecute either major combat operations

or a counterinsurgency campaign, the best strategy for preparedness along the entire spectrum of conflict is to design forces with the appropriate structure, equipment and training to specialize in each respective mode of conflict. These advocates place a greater emphasis on deterrence and conflict avoidance prior to escalation of hostilities. Most argue for a roughly 65/35 mix of conventional force focused and stability operations focused brigade combat teams. According to Hoffman, Division of Labor advocates tend to believe that by specializing forces, the Army and Marines can maintain the forces trained and proficient in handling small wars while shifting “some of the burden for deterring and defeating large-scale aggression to air and naval forces.”¹⁸ Hoffman points out that the most likely threats facing the military in the future will involve Iran, China or North Korea, that all three of these scenarios are vulnerable to stand-off precision warfare, and U.S. political interests can be guaranteed or obtained reliably without ground forces.¹⁹ This assumes that the government can accurately predict where the next conflict will occur, that accurate prediction of how other state or non-state actors may act based on a presumption of America’s own paradigm of rationality is even possible, and that other currently stable areas will not become destabilized through unforeseen actions in the near future. None of these are safe assumptions. In truth, the sheer impact on the conventional force over the last decade of fighting two simultaneous stability operations has taken its toll on the morale, readiness and training of the force.²⁰ These two wars required the commitment of every Brigade Combat Team in the Army and equivalent unit in the Marines at the pace of being deployed at least one year out of every three years, often at a ratio of one year out of every two years. In the late 1990s, no one in the Army anticipated such a high pace of operational

deployments. To specialize only 35% of the force for commitment to stability operations is at best a risky venture and potentially will make it impossible for the U.S. Armed Forces to win a sustained counterinsurgency fight. The size of the force necessary for commitment in the next stability operation is unknown, therefore the total force must remain prepared to fight the nation's battles no matter where these conflicts fall within the full spectrum of conflict. Consequently, the third school of thought described by Frank Hoffman remains the most prevalent among military leaders and the best option for the future force.

Utility Infielders seek a balance between the counterinsurgent and traditionalist approaches by adapting the force structure slightly to embrace the lessons learned in Iraq but yet retaining the Army's advantages and preparedness to fight conventional warfare. They advocate a return to basics in order to address the much atrophied skill sets of conducting major combat operations which the Army has not seen on the scale that it trained in 1980s and 1990s and last experienced in Operation Desert Storm, albeit briefly. Utility Infielders argue that reduced budgets and unknowns in the scope and magnitude of future conflict as well as the category of conflict America will face necessitates that the entire Army be trained and ready to handle all forms of conflict across the full spectrum. This school "seeks to cover the entire spectrum of conflict and avoid the risk of being optimized at either extreme...[and] spreads the risk by investing in quality forces, educating its officers for agility in complex problems, and creating tough but flexible training programs."²¹

Many experts, to include senior military officials, recognize that the greatest current threat to U.S. national security in an age of soaring deficits and domestic

economic challenges is economic recession, or worse, collapse.²² Recent efforts to reverse the trend of drastically rising deficit spending has captured the attention of all and guarantees the military can expect much smaller budgets.²³ In this age of fiscal austerity, Army leadership continues to emphasize the importance of balanced and prudent force restructuring, continued modernization where necessary and dogmatic insistence on maintaining force readiness. Utility Infielders believe that the Army can cover the entire spectrum of conflict by investing in top quality forces, trained and educated in being agile, adaptive and knowledgeable in all aspects of the full spectrum of conflict. In the words of the former Chief of Staff of the Army and new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Martin Dempsey,

Despite the changing character of conflict and increased capability of potential adversaries, the challenge of conducting military operations on land remains fundamentally unchanged. Actions have meaning on the ground because of the interaction of people and as a result of the interdependence of societal factors...humanitarian relief, peacekeeping counterinsurgency and major combat operations are all part of the spectrum of conflict and therefore equal claimants to a position along the full spectrum of operations... [we must be able to accomplish] maneuver and security against whatever threat presents itself.²⁴

The Utility Infielder school of thought is not without its flaws. Detractors of this school of thought argue that the complexity of conventional warfare and stability operations almost guarantee that efforts to ensure that the Army is structured and trained to do both ensures that they will master neither. Though these admonitions are well founded, Utility Infielders argue that the Army has long demonstrated its resourcefulness and immense ability to master many skills and that the future force is up to the challenge. Detractors of the Utility Infielder school of thought also argue that in an age of fiscal austerity, the costs of maintaining readiness through training, education and of modernizing equipment suitable for the entire spectrum of conflict are

too great.²⁵ In truth, some modernization may need to be postponed until the economy recovers fully, however, the costs of losing a conflict for which the nation is wholly unprepared or the loss of influence and prestige for the United States as a world leader could, and in all probability would, be much greater.²⁶ Some costs will be necessary to ensure that the equipment already acquired, which has enabled the success on the field of battle in Iraq and Afghanistan, is maintained and refurbished because it can be useful in future environments. As the analysis of the institutional Army will show below, much of the equipment whether designed for conventional warfare or for stability operations of recent years remains some of the best in the world and merely requires revitalization costs and limited modernization. There will be costs incurred in the sustainment of training and education in the full spectrum of operations; however, these costs are necessary when facing the reality of the uncertain future conflicts and the moral imperative to ensure the land forces are prepared for military operations across the entire spectrum of conflict. Few, if any, predicted the “Arab Spring” in early 2011 and the dust has yet to settle from this significant evolution bordering on revolution in the Middle East. The world does not yet know what the impact of a truly democratic Egypt will be and may not like what it gets. If a democratic Egypt results in a marginalization or dumping of the Camp David Accords and a return to hostilities between Israel and Egypt, U.S. military intervention may be necessary to preserve America’s ally, Israel, and more importantly, to maintain stability in this very volatile and strategically vital region of the world.²⁷ That intervention could be limited to military advisors or could range to major conventional force commitment. The influence of the Jewish lobby and conservative Christian right in American politics has long swayed American foreign

policy in the region and the Armed Forces must be prepared to respond where politics dictate. Some may believe that the prevalence of domestic economic concerns may preclude involvement or commitment of forces in regional disputes but in most cases, such assumptions have proven wrong. One only needs to consider the environment in days following the collapse of the Soviet Union with the Cold War concluded in favor of the United States and the assumption that with this peace dividend, the U.S. could significantly draw down its forces. In reality, the period following the end of the Cold War has seen far more commitment of land forces than ever before across the entire spectrum of conflict in times of both economic affluence and recession. Whether committing forces to the support of humanitarian missions in Haiti or Somalia on the lower end of the spectrum, to commitment of medium-sized forces on long-term peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and Kosovo, to large-scale commitment of conventional forces in long-term stability operations and the initial ground offensives in Iraq and Afghanistan, the nation will call upon the land forces to fight whether the Army is prepared or not. Assuming a peace dividend based on domestic economic concerns as a deterrent to committing land forces or the absence of a current peer competitor capable of threatening the sovereignty of the United States is dangerous and historically inconsistent. America's leaders have a tendency to send the Army into harm's way, confident that it can accomplish any mission because of its track record as a can-do, learning organization.

Consequently, the Army must ensure that the lessons learned from the war in Iraq are not lost and that the Army does not revert back to focusing on the mode of warfare which it finds most comfortable and decisive. The military professional's

solemn oath demands that the Army extends the transformation that the Army undertook in the sands of Iraq and apply it to the institutional Army, ensuring the integration of these lessons where appropriate across the Army's DOTMLPF.

Assuming that counterinsurgency strategy will remain relevant in future conflict, it is imperative that military professionals strive to inculcate the lessons learned from the successful campaign in Iraq and recommend adaptation in the institutional Army in order to preserve those hard earned lessons. The remainder of this paper will highlight some of those lessons and make recommendations for change that appears most significant to ensure that the general purpose forces, assuming the Utility Infielder approach, are prepared to fight and win across the full spectrum of warfare.

The Turning Point in Iraq

By the end of 2006, the security situation in Iraq was rapidly deteriorating as sectarian violence raged, faith and trust in the Iraqi government waned and much of the educated citizenry needed for the reconstruction of Iraq fled out of fear that they could no longer contribute to the rebuilding of Iraq while ensuring the safety of their families. The two-fold strategy of targeting terrorists and extremists while transitioning security to the ISF met countless failures as the ISF often proved ill-equipped or inadequately trained to assume the lead in holding cleared terrain or worse, unwilling to perform and intimidated by both sides of a growing sectarian fight to either passively or actively take part in the violence on one side or the other; this violence was oft described as the harbinger of an all-out civil war. The previous strategy simply did not work and needed to change to the more population centric approach advocated in conventional counterinsurgency theory. As captured in the research study outlining the successful integrated counterinsurgency approach taken against Sunni and Shia insurgents in

2007 and 2008, the strategy had to change from “just killing the enemy,...just spending money on reconstruction projects,...and just putting the Iraqis in charge.”²⁸ Operations Together Forward I and II achieved dismal results because the Iraqis were not ready to assume responsibility and the Army’s focus was not on the center of gravity – the population. Seeking unprecedented cooperation, civil and military partners employed a new strategy based on the following principles.

(1) Make the population and its security the centerpiece of the effort allowing time for economic and political progress; (2) Establish a detailed understanding of the operational environment; (3) Engage in and win a battle of the ideas. Help the population see that supporting the government of Iraq was the best way forward; (4) Walk the walk. Require every coalition civilian and soldier to become a counterinsurgency warrior.²⁹

Beyond the addition of the five brigade combat teams with what came to be known as “the Surge”, a change in mindset across three key areas made the difference. The strategy shifted to a population-centric focus centered on protecting the people in order to isolate the insurgents from the people ensuring that they could no longer intimidate nor coerce passive or active support. In addition, the provision of additional forces in Baghdad, Mosul and Al Anbar allowed the U.S. and Coalition Forces to push out into Joint Security Stations (JSSs) and Combat Outposts (COPs) to be closer to the people and gain their trust and cooperation. Finally, the change in mindset required U.S. Forces to step outside of a western understanding of honor and justice.³⁰ It was imperative to break the cycle of violence. Many insurgents were weary of the violence and sought peace for their tribes and families but remained compelled by their definition of honor and justice to exact retribution on the U.S. Forces and ISF when members of their family were harmed or killed. A western mindset of justice which sought to kill or capture all who conducted attacks on security forces merely perpetuated the cycle of

violence. An emphasis on distinguishing the reconciliables from the irreconciliables yielded opportunities to break the cycle of violence and brought to the table many of the battle-weary Shia militants who wanted to protect their own people and sought peace. This led to the famous Anbar Awakening and reconciliation efforts that led U.S. Forces to accept and embrace as partners in security, former insurgents who weeks and months earlier killed American servicemen.

One of the most significant findings of the case study of successful counter-insurgency strategy in Iraq was the absolute necessity for unity of effort between civil and military authorities, both American and Iraqi. “The integration of civilian and military staffs could not be achieved simply by setting policy. Staffs have markedly different cultures and approaches... [therefore] integration took an active and constant effort to ensure that frictions were overcome.”³¹ Partnering had to occur at all levels from senior level leaders and staff down to Brigade Combat Teams and Battalions paired with Provincial Reconstruction Teams – through this, alignment of the instruments of national power could occur to achieve a common purpose.³²

The Instruments of National Power

One of the most important lessons of the success in Iraq is the indispensable role of applying all instruments of national power in order to succeed in a counterinsurgency campaign. Though this paper does not strive to exhaustively outline how each of these instruments ought to be leveraged as a component of a strategy to win irregular warfare, an understanding of what one means when discussing the instruments of national power is necessary. This understanding helps guide the absolutely crucial efforts to achieve a whole of government approach which serves as a prerequisite to

defeating insurgents. As aptly covered in the Army doctrinal publication covering counterinsurgency strategy, Field Manual 3-24,

Political power is the central issue in insurgencies and counterinsurgencies; each side aims to get the people to accept its governance or authority as legitimate. Insurgents use all available tools—political (including diplomatic), informational (including appeals to religious, ethnic, or ideological beliefs), military, and economic—to overthrow the existing authority. This authority may be an established government or an interim governing body. Counterinsurgents, in turn, use all instruments of national power to sustain the established or emerging government and reduce the likelihood of another crisis emerging.³³

By virtue of its training and exhaustive doctrinal foundation, the Army is adept at leveraging the military instrument of national power to prosecute its strategy to win decisively on the battlefield. However, the lessons of the last decade in Iraq make it clear that leveraging the other instruments of national power are imperative to success in defeating insurgents. Since publication of FM 3-24, the instruments of national power have been expanded by most scholars and strategists to include more than just the diplomatic, informational, military, and economic tools but also include financial, intelligence and law enforcement.³⁴ The military may not take the lead in applying the diplomatic, informational, economic, financial, intelligence and law enforcement instruments of national power but by virtue of its role in providing security to a war-ravaged environment and its hierarchy and capacity for large-scale operations, the military must absolutely understand the important role of applying all of the instruments of national power. The Army must recognize that a blind, Draconian application of only the military instrument can undermine the ultimate success of the strategic goals and merely prolong the conflict rather than resolve it. In this context, instruments of national power refer to the means and methods employed by the state to exert its influence or power over another state or, on occasion, non-state actors.

Diplomacy is the art of communicating intentions and exerting, influencing, and building associations with other actors in the international arena, most frequently employing tools such as negotiations, recognition, treaties, and alliances. Insurgent groups pursue these tools, much like states do, striving to garner popular and external support for their cause to legitimize their ideals while undermining the regime. Through diplomatic negotiations, insurgents strike deals with state and non-state actors external to their country to assist them in their cause, seeking to garner support, safe havens and to add to their legitimacy and the populace's perception of their viability as a replacement for the current regime. The State Department typically takes the lead in U.S. efforts in the diplomatic arena but the Army must understand its role in complementing State Department efforts to combat the insurgents.³⁵

The power of ideas and information cannot be understated. Insurgents typically wage an aggressive information campaign to win the hearts and minds of the people and add to the perception not only that their cause is just but also that they represent a better alternative to the existing regime. As highlighted above, political power is at stake. Information campaigns combined with efforts to supplant the government's efforts to provide for its people are the most effective way to erode perception of legitimacy of the existing regime. Governments typically have the advantage in this area, as they often control access to the media. However, insurgents also have access to means to spread their message. Tools available include fomenting revolutionary ideas under the guise of academic or religious freedoms and expression of ideas. In addition, they often utilize propaganda tools such as the internet, leaflets and multimedia discs, without which an insurgency is less likely to succeed at winning

popular support. The insurgents in Iraq have proven particularly adroit in this area and this single instrument of national power warrants significant attention in the aftermath of the war in Iraq as a better whole of government approach, one that is more proactive and responsive, is necessary. Again, the Department of State typically takes the lead in this area, however, a review of the tools available to the State Department and how the Army should complement those efforts is necessary.

When one thinks of insurgents, what comes to mind most readily is the military arm. Often the most costly portion of an insurgency's campaign against the regime, the military instrument typically receives the most attention by both insurgent forces and the government. Insurgents may seek external support for their military campaign in the form of training, weapons, advisors, or actual combat forces. This support can come from state actors or other insurgents or terrorists either inside or outside the country. The military of the regime often has both numerical and technological advantages over the insurgents, necessitating unique and unconventional strategies. Under these circumstances, insurgents employ their forces on the asymmetrical battlefield to counter governmental strengths. Insurgents often employ terror tactics to intimidate the masses that do not support them or seek to coerce passive or active support from the masses.

One of the most overlooked instruments of national power, the economic instrument is vital to success in a counterinsurgency fight or any stability operation. The government uses economic power to exert its influence abroad and foster prosperity. One of the key lessons learned in Iraq has been that economic efforts with a short-term perspective can often be detrimental to long-term success. Though in an effort to target the root causes of insurgency and popular support for insurgents, economic measures

seeking ephemeral gains often end up further financing the insurgency, thus perpetuating it in the long run. The State Department and the USAID typically take the lead in guiding economic strategies to undermine the insurgency and conduct nation-building efforts seeking to guide a failed state or failing state to a more stable environment, however, with significantly larger resources at their disposal through such programs as the Commander's Emergency Response Fund (CERP) and with doctrine guiding its employment under the concept of Money As a Weapon System (MAWS), military professionals must study the indispensable role of economic development in undermining insurgency and the potentially deleterious effects of misguided economic efforts without an eye to longer-term economic and civil capacity development.³⁶

The financial instrument of national power, in the context of counterinsurgency strategy, typically addresses efforts by government to undermine and interdict funding streams for insurgents. This often involves freezing or seizing assets held by insurgents or their sponsors, especially when linkages can be demonstrated. As the military often lacks the tools to be directly involved in these efforts, military professionals often fail to recognize and pass on invaluable intelligence that may assist the whole of government efforts to target insurgent income sources.³⁷

As a critical war fighting function for military strategy, the intelligence instrument of national power appears to be a key component of the military element of national power. However, Army leaders must recognize that military intelligence is merely a small component of the total resources and capacity of the national level intelligence. Strategic level intelligence complements on site intelligence and the ability to filter raw data and transform that into knowledge and understanding about the adversary is vital

to defeating insurgents. Unlike traditional military intelligence in a conventional battle where the enemy acts along doctrinal orders of battle and conventions, intelligence in the counterinsurgency fight necessitates collating a vast amount of information, working closely with coalition partners, integrating human and technical intelligence and leveraging a plethora of tools and assets in order to optimally target threat groups.³⁸

Finally, the war in Iraq has taught us that any counterinsurgency campaign clearly must include partnerships with law enforcement agencies both U.S. and host nation. Hybrid threats merging criminal, terrorist and insurgent activities continue to hamper law enforcement professionals, military engaged in counterinsurgency fights and political leaders worldwide. In addition, one must advance the rule of law in order to succeed at nation-building and civil capacity development in a state plagued by insurgency. This necessitates relying on law enforcement and judiciary experts and the willingness to subordinate military efficiency and often effectiveness for the sake of achieving the long-term stability achieved in a state that adheres to the rule of law.³⁹ One of the most significant challenges in any counterinsurgency fight, however, lies in preventing, eliminating and when not possible mitigating corruption. Different standards and expectations exist in each culture for levels of acceptable corruption. Insurgents often point to corruption in economic programs, law enforcement and favoritism as justification for the overthrow of the government. Any strategy that seeks to apply the elements of national power must address corruption within a cultural context, seeking to remedy perceptions of relative deprivation amongst the population while accepting that in many cases one must accept nominal levels of favoritism and even some limited

corruption because zero defect approaches to such things are unrealistic and often are counterintuitive within certain cultural settings especially in developing nations.⁴⁰

DOTMLPF Recommendations

Learning has occurred in the Army over the last decade; however, these lessons will be wasted unless institutional adaptation occurs. As David Ucko aptly asserted, “a military organization’s learning can occur on two levels: through bottom-up adaptation in the field and through top-down innovation at the institutional level.”⁴¹ As adaptation in Iraq showed, the Army has deftly achieved the former in contact with the enemy in the sands of Iraq; however, as U.S. Forces depart Iraq, one must identify the changes that the Army can afford and that the future of conflict necessitates. Striking that balance between resources available in a fiscally austere environment and the moral obligation to keep the Army prepared and ready for the full spectrum of operations in which it will be employed necessitates a balanced approach to making evolutionary changes to the Army’s DOTMLPF in the years ahead.

Doctrine. In order to defeat an enemy, one must understand the enemy he faces. A fundamental principle of Army doctrine lies in the axiom that one must see oneself, see the terrain, and see the enemy – this truism is especially salient at the strategic level when combating an insurgency. In May 2009, Michele Flournoy, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, stated that success against asymmetric threats will rest heavily on the nation’s ability to institutionalize, in doctrine, the knowledge that the force gained in Iraq.⁴² One of the most significant long-term adaptations resulting from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan was the development of FM 3-24, *Counterinsurgency*, published on 15 December 2006. This doctrinal update aptly captures the principles and guidelines for conducting counterinsurgency operations, rooted in historical examples, informed by

well-organized academic scholarly writings and updated in contemporary experiences. This doctrinal foundation formed the basis for the successful strategy in Iraq and served as one of the principle reasons why President Bush selected General Petraeus to become the new MNF-I Commander as he sought to adopt a counterinsurgency strategy in 2007 to turn back the tide of successive failures and setbacks in 2006. Bard O'Neill's text titled *Insurgency and Terrorism* served as the foundation to the new doctrine's methodology of analyzing and classifying an insurgency in order to achieve the best strategy to defeat it.⁴³ This text provides a fantastic foundation for "seeing the enemy" and provides one of the most comprehensive, systematic and straight-forward formats for analyzing and understanding the type of insurgency that one faces.

The nation's success in Iraq is directly attributable to adopting the counter-insurgency strategy found in the new doctrine of FM 3-24 and the principles of a more integrated civil-military cooperative effort leveraging all the instruments of national power to achieve complementary effects in undermining root causes of the insurgency while enhancing the perception and reality of legitimacy for the host nation government. As discovered by GEN (Ret) LaPorte's research team and captured in *The Comprehensive Approach: An Iraq Case Study*, every coalition civilian and Soldier had to become a counterinsurgency warrior.⁴⁴ In practical application, this required military leaders from the squad to theater level to recognize that military objectives must be nested with long-term political goals. Soldiers had to look beyond immediate goals of a military strategy and look to the long-term second- and third-order effects.⁴⁵

As for counterinsurgency doctrine, the Army has a sound foundation in FM 3-24. There are however, two recommended areas of further improvement necessary to

ensure that the lessons of this war are not lost as the experienced practitioners of this successful strategy in Iraq move to the cadre of non-practicing professionals. First, the Army must capture the techniques, tactics and procedures that made the application of counterinsurgency strategy successful. The foreword of FM 3-24 acknowledges that the doctrine “takes a general approach to counterinsurgency operations.”⁴⁶ The doctrine found in FM 3-24 deftly captures the essence of understanding one’s enemy, protecting the population, targeting the root causes of insurgency through cooperative and integrated efforts that capitalize on complementary effects of all of the instruments of national power but lacks practical guidance on how this might occur in practice. Though FM 3-24.2, *Tactics in Counterinsurgency*, provides a useful supplement to FM 3-24 facilitating understanding of counterinsurgency tactical operations at the company, battalion and brigade levels based on lessons learned, a gap in the doctrine exists in better explaining what role the tactical and operational leaders play in leveraging all of the instruments of national power to achieve strategic goals.⁴⁷ An opportunity exists for a comprehensive study that helps to explain how leaders at every level support the overall integrated counterinsurgency strategy in a whole of government approach.

Secondly, though in practice on the ground under the leadership of first Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus followed by each of their successors, desired civil-military cooperation was achieved to facilitate greater unity of effort, the doctrine explaining the roles and responsibilities for the application of all of the instruments of national power is lacking.⁴⁸ The nature of the hybrid threat and that fact that U.S. power could be challenged for so long in Iraq, very narrowly avoiding defeat, all but guarantees that future enemies will challenge us asymmetrically seeking

protracted conflict over decisive battles and insurgent strategies over conventional ones. The Army's doctrine and experience demonstrate that a whole of government approach is necessary to achieve success. As averred by Edward Marks, "the so-called nexus of security challenges – terrorism, narcotics, smuggling, international criminal networks, etc. – can no longer be managed as single agency programs but must be integrated into 'whole of government' programs."⁴⁹ As such, the U.S. government needs to capture doctrine that delineates responsibilities for each aspect of a whole of government approach. This doctrine can and must be revised based on the unique circumstances of each environment but a foundational guiding document is necessary that can guide this critical component to an integrated civil-military approach to defeat insurgencies. The Department of Defense and the Department of the Army can play a role in helping to guide and craft recommendations for this doctrine as doctrinal development remains one of the military's traditional strengths.

Organization. For the most part, the Army's force structure has remained optimized for major combat operations. Organizationally, the Army made short-term modifications to enable security force assistance by initially mobilizing tens of thousands of advisors to serve as MiTT Teams (Military Transition Teams) and later by creating STTs (Security Transition Teams) to augment each brigade deploying after the summer of 2009 thus completing the transformation of the Brigade Combat Team (BCT) into the Advise and Assist Brigade (AAB). These organizational changes were temporary in nature and brought together teams and units for the discrete period of the deployment to enable the military to succeed at one of its principle roles of Security Force Assistance (SFA). These efforts sought to enable the military instrument of national

power to contribute to long term stability in Iraq by directly facilitating enhanced capacity and capability of ISF through advise, train and assist functions. Though some members of the Counterinsurgent school of thought may advocate re-organizing the basic building block of deployable combat troops, tossing out the modular BCT, this approach is fraught with risks. As articulated above, the Army must remain prepared for all levels of conflict along the full spectrum of operations and it is improbable that a redesigned brigade formation optimized for counterinsurgency operations would be well-suited for major combat operations. Consequently, the modular BCT should retain its current organization with perhaps greater integration of subordinate civil affairs units or skill sets covered in greater detail under the category of Personnel below. Recent initiatives to consider subtle changes to the modular BCT while regionally aligning brigades not currently slated for deployment to Army Service Component Commands (ASCCs) hold great promise for helping to prepare forces for possible contingency operations and to facilitate greater understanding of the regional operating environment while preparing for the full spectrum of operations.

Other capabilities have proven invaluable to the success of the mission in Iraq. Small teams of experts with unique skill sets have been added to BCTs in Iraq in order to provide capability uniquely needed and especially critical in stability operations. These skills must be codified in some manner to ensure that they are retained for future conflicts. To name a few, the expertise provided by WIT teams (Weapons Intelligence Team) in exploitation of IEDs and unique unconventional weaponry, HTTs (Human Terrain Teams) skilled in providing insight into the population and how they may react in order to enhance operational effectiveness, save lives, and reduce military and civilian

conflict, and LEPs (Law Enforcement Professionals) who provide insights to military commanders in how to develop prosecutable cases based on evidence vice intelligence when targeting insurgents has proved invaluable in Iraq. In the current budgetary environment, adding these organizations to the BCT table of organization and equipment is improbable; however, the Army can seek to train some similar skills and expertise in those organizations that have more limited roles in stability operations. For instance, on a recent deployment to Iraq, the 3rd BCT of 4th ID's chemical reconnaissance platoon received training so that it could perform the WIT mission for the brigade in southern Iraq. Though unlikely to be able to build the depth of anthropological, sociological and linguistic expertise in the active force found in the HTTs recently deployed to Iraq, a serious look at creating this capacity within the reserves merits consideration. The reserves should also consider developing organizations to train and maintain LEP expertise for future requirements.

Nonetheless, recommendations for change to the organizational structure within the institutional Army and generating force are warranted. Criticisms abound against the generating force's ability to provide replacement personnel in a timely manner under the ARFORGEN (Army Forces Generation) model. Occasionally, the equipping and training cycles of the ARFORGEN process were horribly out of synch with the manning cycle resulting in units preparing for tours in combat at far less than their authorized manning up until weeks or months before the unit's deploy date.⁵⁰ Organizational and policy changes are warranted to ensure that these ARFORGEN cycles are better aligned – lives often depend on it. Additionally, though OPTEMPO will likely decrease in the coming years as U.S. Forces withdraw first from Iraq and then Afghanistan, the

need to keep the general purpose forces prepared to respond across the full spectrum of conflict will necessitate creative strategies in addressing periodic major combat operations focused training and counterinsurgency and stability operations focused training. This combined with declining resources in light of reduced defense budgets for the near future, will necessitate that the Army strike the right balance between live, virtual and constructive training. Though addressed in greater detail below under the Training and Facilities headings, the institutional Army, particularly under the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), must look to redesign itself to maximize use of virtual training technology to allow units at company, battalion and ideally up to brigade level to train using simulations in stability operations.⁵¹

Finally, though outside the direct authority of the senior leadership of the Army, the realization that the only path to success in the stability operations, especially in the counterinsurgency fight, lies in a whole of government approach, necessitates a relook of the DoD's ground combatant commands (GCCs) to better integrate civilian and military assets and ensure continuous interagency cooperation. If the Army is sincere about its desire to better enable a whole of government approach to resolve conflicts in the future, change is needed not just in the wartime organizations designed to handle conflict but also in peace-time organizations to better foster interagency cooperation. Much like the need for the 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Act which forced greater joint force cooperation, redesign of the government's approach to regional interagency cooperation will likely require legislative action by Congress. In his article, "Death of the Combatant Command? Toward a Joint Interagency Approach," authors BG Buchanan, Captain Davis and Colonel Wright advocate the replacement of geographical combatant

commands with Joint Interagency Commands (JIACOM), led by highly credentialed civilians in permanent standing, civilian-led interagency organizations that can bring all of the instruments of national power to bear in either peace or conflict. They aptly assess that the greatest impediment to such progress lies in overcoming the resistance to dogmatic defense of “rice bowls”, particularly in the DoD and a requirement for a significant funding increase for other major federal government agencies that would play a role in these new JIACOMs. The benefits of this approach are that it could truly foster unity of effort across all of the instruments of national power through all phases of the operation, and could ease angst in some regions by minimizing the overt appearance of military dominance particularly in those areas that are sensitive to military presence.⁵²

At echelons below the Geographical Combatant Command, military echelons partnered with U.S. Embassies, Regional Embassy Offices (REOs), and Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in order to pursue whole-of-government solutions to winning the counterinsurgency. Initially PRTs were paired at the Brigade level and above but as the responsible drawdown of forces occurred in Iraq, PRTs began to pair with battalions responsible for whole provinces. This often left a gap in partnership at the Brigade level, responsible for four to six provinces with multiple PRT partners each paired with a subordinate battalion and each with competing priorities and desires for the Brigade Commander’s attention. In Iraq, these challenges were met without adding a Department of State regional authority. However, in Afghanistan, a Sub-National and Regional echelon, led by Department of State, was created to better partner with DOD and GIRoA. From CALL Handbook, 11-16, one can find,

To ensure all U.S. PRT efforts are synchronized, the ambassador established the PRT Sub-National Government Office, which in August

2009 became the Interagency Provincial Affairs (IPA). The new name increased the emphasis on unity of effort among U.S. Government agencies and to indicate that the scope would be beyond just the PRTs. The IPA's organizational structure parallels military command and control structure. It has regional platforms (RPs) that mirror the regional commands (RC), each with a senior civilian representative (SCR), who is the counterpart to the military commander in each RC. The SCR's main task is to foster civil-military integration through the civilians working under them at the task force, PRT, and district support team (DST) levels.⁵³

Though the IPA, RPs, and PRTs were created for the specific applications of Operation Enduring Freedom in the extremely decentralized operations in Afghanistan, valuable lessons can be drawn and should be retained for ensuring mirrored partnership and cooperation occurs at every level to ensure unity of effort and a true whole of government approach in future stability operations.

Training. The Utility Infielder approach outlined above necessitates periodic training in both major combat operations and stability operations to ensure that general purpose forces are prepared for the entire spectrum of conflict. Large-scale conventional warfare represents the only existential threat to the nation and therefore, though improbable, must receive emphasis to both deter a conventional attack on U.S. interests or soil and to enable the U.S. military to fight and win a conventional fight. Because of the greater probability that the Army will face hybrid threats challenging the U.S. through a combination of irregular warfare, terrorism and transnational crime, the Army must also be prepared to conduct counterinsurgency operations. Based in part on the turbulence in the Army resulting from frequent personnel moves and command cycles which are typically two years long, a rotational cycle alternating between one year focused on major combat operations and the next year on stability operations appears to offer the best solution to a balanced approach for full spectrum training. Traditionally, combat training center (CTC) rotations have served as the capstone event

to any unit's training for combat operations or combat readiness. Because of the realism and focus that the CTCs bring to training, these centers must be protected from elimination in defense department belt-tightening. To save money, there will necessarily be cutbacks. Redundancy and frivolous expenditures are rampant in training budgets but the quality of the U.S. Army and its adaptability and success in the wars in the Middle East are in no small part a result of the CTCs. Creating exportable packages for the stability operations training cycles that can move from installation to installation to facilitate counterinsurgency training will likely prove more cost effective than dedicating a CTC to stability operations or creating an altogether new CTC. Potential also exists in untapped possibilities resulting from simulations training which might realistically create scenarios to better train general purpose forces to better understand the nature of the counterinsurgency environment. A tremendous cost in current efforts to create realistic environments at the CTCs includes hiring thousands of Iraqi-Americans to simulate environments in which U.S. Forces will serve. In light of defense budget cuts ahead and the ambiguity of which environments that U.S. Forces are likely to deploy in the future, the Army needs to capitalize on savings achievable through greater reliance on virtual and constructive training.⁵⁴ The institutional Army should take the lead in development of these training scenarios and capabilities. Finally, the Chief of Staff recently directed a study to align brigades regionally with ASCCs. Through this strategy, BCTs not programmed for operational deployments would focus their future scanning efforts, intelligence analysis and training scenarios on real-world possibilities in environments in which they might deploy. This concept may ultimately allow these forces to train for and achieve counterinsurgency and stability

operations readiness at a training center located in a nation within the respective Geographic Combatant Command or Regionally Aligned Brigade's areas of operation.

As frequently identified in critiques of military strategy in the early part of the Iraq war, one of the fundamental flaws of U.S. strategy in Iraq included a failure to truly understand both America's adversary and partners in the counterinsurgency and nation-building efforts. The change in strategy to a population-centric strategy, and more importantly the realization that the cycle of violence was being perpetuated by the very efforts to stop the violence, led U.S. military leadership to expend significant efforts in training deploying units on Iraqi culture. This aided U.S. Forces at all levels to consider the second- and third-order effects of their choices and to better embrace both the ISF with whom they were partnered and the people for whom they were responsible to protect. The Army must never again underestimate the critical role of understanding cultural differences, especially when conducting counterinsurgency operations. Cultural training goes beyond mere cultural awareness of the language, artifacts, or symbols of a culture; one must gain a true understanding of the underlying assumptions of another culture. A two-fold approach would facilitate greater cultural sensitivity. First, pre-deployment training must include extensive cultural training – this is as important as inoculations, weapons training or preparation of equipment. Second, the Army should invest in cultural expertise in areas where conflict remains probable. Prior to escalation of hostilities and an order to deploy, this subject matter expertise could reside with the ASCCs but as a matter of recurrent training could conduct training opportunities with the regionally aligned brigades as part of the ASCC's Security Cooperation Plan (SCP).

As a final point for training, the PRTs proved invaluable in aligning efforts of the Department of State and Department of Defense in each province in Iraq. With the military withdrawal from Iraq and scaling down of the mission in Baghdad, the Department of State, through the formation of the Civil Response Corps (CRC), has already begun initiatives to ensure that organizationally they are at least partially restructured to provide responsive interagency expertise to deploy on short notice to serve in austere environments to prevent conflict. The CRC is comprised of “specially trained civilians from across the U.S. government who deploy rapidly to help countries mitigate conflict” providing a surge in civilian power consisting of “diplomats, development specialists, public health officials, law enforcement and corrections officers, engineers, economists, lawyers, and others” who help fragile states restore stability and achieve economic recovery.⁵⁵ There remains, however, a tremendous potential for military and other agency professionals to lose the experience at achieving integrated civil-military cooperation to achieve decisive results. The cultures, experiences and jargon of the military professional and that of other federal agencies are vastly different. The creation of the CRC represents the first step of enabling State Department and other federal agencies to rapidly deploy and respond to contingencies; however, training is the necessary next step. This training would help prevent atrophy of the cooperation between federal agencies and the military in providing for regional stability in fragile or failed states and could help ensure common understanding and appreciation for the talents and skills each agency brings to the civil-military integrated approach to conflict resolution. We must strive to integrate CRC members and other members of the various federal agencies responsible for elements of national power

into training designed to sustain in the Army the experience and understanding of the civilian agency competencies and capabilities. As the Army tends toward the Utility Infielder approach, training Soldiers in alternating cycles of MCO and COIN will place the Army in the best position to facilitate this cooperative civil-military training opportunity. The State Department, and others, should be encouraged to eagerly participate in and support these training opportunities.

Materiel. Materiel requirements for stability operations vice a large scale conventional battle are vastly different. Some have argued that reliance on the tools of conventional warfare, namely heavy combat vehicles like Abrams tanks and Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicles, long after the end of the conventional fight exacerbated the conditions that expanded the support for the insurgency. There may be some truth to these assertions as the difficulty of maneuver in an urban environment with such vehicles inevitably leads to unintended damages. On the other hand, with the innovation by insurgents in using Explosively Formed Projectiles (EFPs), the Army lacked the platforms necessary to protect its Soldiers while still minimizing the impact on the populace. Protection of the populace must remain the foremost goal in any counterinsurgency fight in order to isolate the insurgent from the populace. Gains secured in protecting the population, however, will be Pyrrhic at best if these efforts are not balanced with accepting only prudent risks and ensuring better force protection measures for the Soldiers executing the counterinsurgency strategy. The M1 tank could be decisive in any set-piece battle against the insurgents but the insurgent rarely, if ever, contested the Army in this way. A better platform for the day-to-day Clear-Build-Hold strategy of counterinsurgency warfare and to facilitate nation-building was

necessary. The Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) provided this enhancement that, though still too big for some of the more densely populated areas, greatly enabled U.S. Forces to conduct their missions. Countless other innovations developed over the last decade, including biometric identification technology, robotic enhancements for IED interrogation, jamming technology for IED defeat, and other protective equipment enhancements, greatly facilitated force protection and U.S. Forces' ability to target the insurgents. Materiel advancements attained over the last decade to protect U.S. Forces and target elusive enemies were essential to success in Iraq. The Army must refit and recapitalize this major investment in the Army's capability to conduct stability operations and must continue to train on this equipment. In addition, the Army has operated essentially under a "shadow" Modified Table of Organization and Equipment (MTO&E) in Iraq and Afghanistan, leaving behind much of the heavy combat vehicles at home station and receiving the fleet of MRAPs as well as other state of the art technology and off-the-shelf material solutions to accomplish the mission in theater. A thorough look at the impact of this vital equipment to discern what should be added to unit MTO&Es is necessary to retain specialty equipment useful for anticipated future combat scenarios while phasing out that equipment that merely met a short-term and unique problem to the Iraq and Afghanistan situations. In some cases, limited personnel subject matter expertise or additional skill identifiers (ASIs) and training should be captured to operate, maintain and service this specialized equipment.⁵⁶

Technology, however, is ever-changing and evolving. The capabilities developed for the fights in Iraq and Afghanistan may not be effective in the next counterinsurgency fight in which the Army finds itself. MRAPs would likely be too heavy for fighting an

insurgent force in a jungle environment and advancements in technology exploited by insurgents may defeat jamming technology which was so successful in overcoming the remotely controlled IED. More important to the Army's ability to adapt and improve the materiel necessary for stability operations is a significant overhaul of the acquisition process. In a superb article by LTG Michael Vane in *Military Review*, he describes two significant enhancements that would better improve the provision of the essential materiel to the war-fighter. Adaptation during a time of war is extremely complex and timeliness of response is often a matter of life and death for the troops on the front lines. As LTG Vane aptly identifies, sometimes equipment solutions in a time of war, out of the compulsion to provide something to the fielded force to counter an enemy threat, complicate the execution of other tasks, when the solution lacks the "complete DOTMLPF package."⁵⁷ Fielding less than the complete package often leads to unnecessary burdens placed on the field force. Off-the-shelf technology without the proper training in its use, as well as complications in interoperability of forces resulting from compatibility issues, can wreak havoc on the operations of forces in the field.⁵⁸ The Army must overhaul the acquisition process to better streamline provision of materiel solutions that support the war-fighter while providing whole DOTMLPF solutions. LTG Vane's article provides numerous suggestions on streamlining capabilities development for rapid implementation, better feedback processes and testing of materiel by fielded forces before purchase and enhanced Operational Needs Statements (ONS) processing as necessary improvements to enable more effective provision of materiel solutions to the combatant.⁵⁹

Secondly, the Department of Defense desperately needs acquisition reform. “Fostering change and adaptation must move beyond internal Army processes...to broaden into the realm of weapons acquisition reform.”⁶⁰ Though the Defense Department has improved in its efforts to get the right equipment to the troops over the last decade, more reform is necessary to ensure continued improvements and to guarantee that a return to the cumbersome processes from before the war does not occur. In its current state, the acquisition process remains too time-consuming to be responsive to the needs of the fielded force. In 2009, Senator Levin stated:

Ninety-five of DoD’s largest acquisition programs are, on average, two years behind schedule and have exceeded their original budgets by a combined total of almost \$300 billion...when the federal budget is under immense strain as a result of the economic crisis, we simply cannot afford this kind of continued waste and inefficiency.⁶¹

LTG Vane adroitly outlines the challenges facing the acquisition community as time and costs. As technology life-cycles are decreasing, on average to 18 months, the time needed to develop and field major weapon systems has increased to an average of ten years.⁶² The hybrid threats that the Army faces can easily outmaneuver an acquisition process that remains this unresponsive. Spiraling costs in acquisition processes coinciding with budget cuts will make advancements cost prohibitive. For the Army’s part, LTG Vane advocates simplification of requirements, greater use of off-the-shelf technology, rapid iterative prototyping and fielding of holistic solutions, and the placement of Soldiers on new prototype systems as early in the process as possible.⁶³

Finally, in this fiscally austere environment, governmental leaders will emphasize the need to cut costs. Many of the recommendations in this report entail costs that could be construed as prohibitive in light of budget cuts. In recent months, Army leadership has been emphasizing the importance of a balanced approach to drawdown

and budgetary belt-tightening. Cuts must be balanced across the three lines of end strength, force structure and programs. To cut one more heavily than the other will lead to systems without personnel to man them, personnel without the equipment necessary to complete their tasks or programs without either the equipment or personnel needed to make them effective – thus leading to the hollow Army that this country cannot afford. The materiel that the Army, and by extension the Air Force and Navy, has to prosecute high intensity conflict remains some of the best in the world. The technological overmatch of the M1A2SEP tank, the AH-64D attack helicopter and the Army's C4ISR systems, just to name a few, compared to the country's closest competitor is significant. Most analysts predict that the recession America is experiencing will end within the next five to fifteen years. With the technological superiority of the U.S. Army over its closest competitor, a more concerted effort should be made not just to strive for the next advancement in capabilities for the sake of keeping America's competitive edge but should be focused on that technology needed to keep a competitive edge over the nation's most likely adversaries' capabilities. In defense technology development, there is frequently a temptation to seek new technology merely for the sake of having new imagined capabilities; however, in this age of fiscal austerity, though it is vital to maintain some modernization efforts, these research and development (R&D) priorities should be focused on necessary requirements based on thorough strategic environmental scanning. Some programs for materiel enhancements may need to be postponed in order to ensure that the training capability and readiness of the force remains paramount in this fiscally austere period.⁶⁴

Leadership and Education. Understanding the complexities of conducting stability operations must remain a core component of Army leadership training and education. The doctrine is not worth the paper it is written on if the Army fails to ensure that counterinsurgency warfare holds an equal position in the Army's leadership training centers. If the Army leadership expects new junior leaders to take this complex form of conflict seriously, counterinsurgency strategy must not be relegated back to a mere three-day block of instruction out of a six-month leader training curriculum. In recent years, the Basic Officer Leadership Course and Captain's Career Course have both placed counterinsurgency doctrine on a much higher footing in the curriculum – rightly so but out of the necessity of the wars in which the Army is embroiled. A return to steady-state operations with the end of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan could lead some to advocate a return to a focus on conventional warfare to the exclusion of stability operations. The institutional Army should prevent this from happening. The curriculums of officer and non-commissioned officer developmental courses must address counterinsurgency doctrine and stability operations as it applies to the level of leadership being trained. Fundamentals of the doctrine should be taught at all levels facilitating emphasis on the nature of counterinsurgency warfare and the lessons hard-earned in Iraq and Afghanistan. Likewise, there are countless other equally important lessons to be retained from U.S. operations in Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo and the Philippines from other stability operations conducted over the last two decades. These lessons, focused on by the "schoolhouse", should not be those characteristics unique to the enemies faced in these wars but should stress the basics – to protect the population,

understand the operating environment, attack the root causes of the insurgency, and seek a whole of government approach to achieve victory, to name a few.

The leadership and educational training apparatus of the institutional Army must seek greater opportunities to train the officer and non-commissioned officer corps to be agile, creative and resourceful leaders capable of responding under pressure. If Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom taught the Army nothing else, it taught that agile, adaptive and thinking junior leaders were vital to success on the battlefield. The institutions designed for training junior leaders from the Warrior Leadership Course to the Captain's Career Course must seek opportunities to challenge their students in ambiguous, uncertain and challenging environments to both build agility and instill confidence.⁶⁵

The importance of understanding and considering second- and third-order effects by the Army's junior leaders cannot be over-emphasized. In addition to agile thinking and adaptability in an ambiguous environment, junior leaders in the Army today must have a greater understanding of the world around them. "The operating environment has changed and with it new and evolving technologies have emerged...curriculums should cover subjects like counter IED, battle command networks, power and energy, robotics, joint enablers and the human dimension."⁶⁶ The educational institutions must be future scanning organizations that look not just to the past and present but must also strive to anticipate the likely threats and to constantly adapt the curriculum to areas of likely threats. With the implementation of the regionally aligned brigades with ASCCs, the leader development institutions could bring subject matter experts to the schoolhouse to familiarize their students on the likely threats they will face when they

return to their units and deploy on contingency operations. Though this was easier done recently as the Army has been more focused on Afghanistan and Iraq, this is nonetheless equally important to sustain in the future when the Army returns to steady-state operations. Leader development institutions should place greater emphasis on cultural awareness as well as negotiation skills. They must likewise work to overcome the biases in the Army toward other agencies of the government as the whole of government approach to defeating insurgencies remains pivotal to success.

There will be a natural tendency to hone in on conventional warfare – a return to pre-war normal, and to eschew the counterinsurgency wars fought over the last decade. Integration of stability operations lessons as an essential component of leadership training holds the best chance for preventing this tendency. As David Ucko asserted:

The counterinsurgency community advances a cause that is anathematic to the traditional American way of war...the use of force in counterinsurgency campaigns cannot be overwhelming; victory – where achieved – is ambiguous rather than decisive; the winning formula is low-tech and high-risk and casualties must be expected as part of a long-haul effort likely to span years if not decades.⁶⁷

Understanding the different characteristics and strategies for combating adversaries along the full spectrum of warfare must be a critical component of every level of the Army's leadership training institutions.

The Army prides itself on having multi-functional, capable and adaptive Soldiers. Though the Army benefits from the specialization of skills, the counterinsurgency environment has decidedly leveled the playing field. Whereas, the linear nature of the conventional battlefield makes it less likely that rear echelon personnel will need to be familiar with the combat functions of front line troops, the nonlinear, noncontiguous nature of the counterinsurgency battlefield makes it critical that all personnel have a

better background and training in counterinsurgency tactics and doctrine. In addition, the reality of the counterinsurgency battlefield is that even the smallest actions or inactions of individual Soldiers can have grave consequences to the overall chances of victory. The Soldiers responsible for the gross negligence and misconduct at Abu Ghraib failed to consider the second- and third-order effects of their actions to the total war effort. Their actions, more so than anything else, contributed more to the swelling of the insurgent's ranks in 2004 and 2005. Concerted efforts must continue to be made, through training in the institutional Army, to educate Soldiers on how their actions can have grave consequences on their fellow Soldiers – countless Americans died as a result of the virulent attacks perpetrated by those incensed by the human rights violations of Abu Ghraib.

Personnel. The Army, at every level, tends to seek more personnel to meet the growing demands of a complex environment. The military remains the best manned, best resourced, and best trained force in the world and receives a sizeable portion of the government's budgetary spending. Rarely will one find agencies or units in the military asking to be downsized, but with personnel costs contributing to almost a quarter of the defense budget and the rising costs of military pensions, requests for additional personnel are unlikely to be met with a favorable response.⁶⁸ Fundamentally, the Army must find ways to do more with what they have and should anticipate significant end strength reductions. A reduction of the active component end strength from 570,000 to 490,000 is already underway as announced by the President, the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on 5 January 2012 and elaborated on by GEN Odierno on 27 January 2012.⁶⁹ Reductions to meet the already

directed 487 billion dollar budgetary cuts in the Defense budget over the next decade necessitate tough decisions in a resource constrained world.⁷⁰ Sequestration could also lead to significantly more cuts if bipartisan compromise is not reached over the next year. Consequently, this paper will refrain from flying in the face of current trends but does suggest greater generalization of some functions to create capacity for needed subject matter expertise to better enable the force to fight and win across the full spectrum of conflict. The institutional Army should undertake an exhaustive search for redundancy in its personnel and should seek to eliminate these overlaps where possible.

In addition, there are current military occupational specialties (MOS) currently assigned to MTO&Es that have mission profiles more uniquely tailored to major combat operations and less applicable in stability operations. As alluded to above in the discussion on organizational transformation, some of these MOSs which have limited roles in major combat operations could be “dual hatted” for missions in stability environments in order to reduce the need for adding personnel when the Army is already facing an 80,000 troop reduction. For instance, chemical personnel have been trained for years in preparation of Unit Status Reports (USR) because battalion chemical officers and chemical non-commissioned officers habitually were assigned this additional duty. Similarly, in lieu of seeking to add personnel to gain the subject matter expertise needed to conduct economic development, the institutional Army should review and consider certifying those MOSs that have more limited roles in stability operations with additional skill identifiers to be better prepared for civil capacity development, economic development and host nation security forces training. Fire

direction officers and non-commissioned officers over the last decade have routinely assumed electronic warfare duties and received training stateside before deploying to be better prepared to perform these duties. If these critical skills needed for IED defeat and nation-building are not to be added to the Brigade and Battalion MTO&E, then additional ASIs and additional duties need to be codified in the MTO&E to ensure that the Army retains these vital skill sets. In this age of defense budget cuts, the Army must learn from its business brethren and seek to find greater efficiency and savings in order to ensure that it can fence resources needed to maintain the balance between end strength, force modernization and readiness.⁷¹

If the room for slight increases in manpower existed after prudent cost cutting measures across the board, the personnel function most lacking in the fielded forces that merits change lies in the lack of a trained and capable section at the battalion and brigade level to facilitate and enable interagency training. Too often these roles are passed on to a junior- or mid-grade officer and a “pick-up” team of Soldiers to work with and facilitate the Provincial Reconstruction Teams, non-governmental organizations, or other international governmental organizations. Few of these ad hoc teams were ever prepared for these daunting responsibilities. If the Army truly desires a greater whole of government approach to prosecuting and winning a counterinsurgency campaign, there must be efforts to create greater subject matter expertise in cooperation with these other agencies. Expertise in advancing rule of law and judicial responsibility, professionalization of partnered police and border enforcement forces, expertise in civil capacity development at the local through provincial level, proficiency in economic development capacity, and in creating an environment for development of essential

services are all needed at the brigade level at the very least and optimally down to the battalion level. At this point, such growth in personnel at the tactical level remains unlikely but should be remembered as opportunities arise at a later date or if the concept of “reversibility” is necessitated.

Facilities. Equally constrained by budgetary cuts will be any significant expansion of existing facilities. Though military construction only constituted 3.1 percent of the defense budget last year, it has been on the rise over the last decade and will likely see decreases in the years ahead.⁷² Consequently, a recommendation to create a new CTC that caters to stability operations training or significant facilities development to enable home station training will likely meet stiff resistance. The Army will need to do more with what it already has. Efforts to keep the force trained and ready for counterinsurgency operations will likely necessitate greater reliance on simulations as a means to reduce costs associated with live training. An exportable training package capable of moving from home station to home station much like the MRAP and R2C2 trainers developed and used in recent years could provide the simulations venue needed for this training shortfall while keeping costs relatively low.

In addition, one of the most significant challenges to getting civilian subject matter experts from other governmental agencies to join the Army in training for contingency operations is their lack of opportunity. Department of State personnel already operate at a distinctly high OPTEMPO spending years at a time overseas in positions in U.S. embassies abroad only to return to Washington D.C. for an equally high-paced lifestyle with many demands on their time. Making time to join brigades training for counterinsurgency operations, in order to ensure greater civil-military

integration will remain difficult at best. The development of a virtual civil-military training center could facilitate better cooperation and relationship development that would better enable a whole of government approach in deployed environments.

Finally, facilities already best suited for the live training which is vital to success on any battlefield must be invested in and maintained. The CTCs offer some of the best training available anywhere in the world and greatly enabled the Army's successful stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. These CTCs cannot and should not become sacrificial lambs for budgetary cutbacks or readiness of the force and the feasibility of "reversibility" will suffer.

Conclusion

A common thread runs through most of these recommendations that the Army must never again approach counterinsurgency, and associated nation-building, without a whole of government approach. Well-documented in academic writing, success in the counterinsurgency fight in Iraq necessitated civil-military cooperation at all levels to achieve the complementary effects of bringing all of the instruments of national power to defeat an insurgency. The Army may not be able to directly affect change in all federal agencies to ensure a whole of government approach in future stability operations but it can condition the profession of arms to understand the indispensability of approaching counterinsurgency strategy with an eye to a whole of government approach and to applying all of the instruments of national power to win on the ground. Such efforts at the outset will shorten the overall length of any conflict and will enhance the probability of success thus reducing the probability of another protracted war for which the American people lack political will and cannot afford, and the military cannot sustain the OPTEMPO, especially with decreasing end strength. The economic recession and

concomitant federal budget cuts will drive the military to belt-tightening measures in the years ahead; however, it would be irresponsible to repeat the mistakes of the past seeking to ignore the lessons learned from the successful counterinsurgency strategy in Iraq. A scan of future conflict facing the Army yields ambiguous results – one cannot predict the exact nature of America’s future fights but the Army does have a responsibility to the American people to be prepared for the likelihood of hybrid threats while remaining trained and ready to fight and win on the conventional battlefield to defeat existential threats. These obligations require that the Army address institutional changes to better prepare the force to fight and win counterinsurgency warfare while still remaining capable at major combat operations.

Endnotes

¹ For details of President Barak Obama, Secretary Leon Panetta and GEN Martin Dempsey’s press conference on the defense strategy given on 5 January 2011, see Lisa Daniel, “Guidance Guards Against All Threats Officials Say”, January 5, 2012 <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=66688> (accessed on January 30, 2012). Even as this paper was being written, our national executive and military leadership are working to fully understand the nature of the evolving nature of future warfare, how our nation will prepare for and address that future and resource this new defense strategy in light of budget cuts. New military strategy guidance unveiled at the Pentagon on 5 January does not change the Defense Department’s longstanding commitment to prevail against any adversary anywhere but it does drop the longstanding commitment to fight two land wars simultaneously replacing that paradigm with a strategy that stresses an agile and flexible force capable of responding to disparate and complicated threats. The President, Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs emphasized that the future threats that the U.S. might face will be varied and may be unpredictable but that the force will use “innovative methods -- including low-cost and small-scale operations, rotational deployments and exercises” in order to ensure that budget cuts do not come at the expense of U.S. strategic interests.

² Robert M. Gates, speech to the Corps of Cadets, United States Military Academy, West Point, NY, February 25, 2011, accessed online at <http://www.cfr.org/national-security-and-defense/speech-secretary-defense-robert-m-gates-west-point/p24264> (accessed on November 1, 2011).

³ For an understanding of the most recent guidance to the U.S. Armed Forces on the future of warfare and priorities that this future will shape, see Leon E. Panetta, *Department of Defense Strategic Guidance: Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership – Priorities for 21st Century Defense*

(Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, January 2012), 10. In fact, the President, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff publicly unveiled the new Strategic Guidance for 2012 on 5 January 2012 acknowledging that counter terrorism and irregular warfare remain at the top of the list of mission priorities for the U.S. Armed Forces in 2012 and beyond.

⁴ There is extensive debate in military, political and academic circles about whether the U.S. war in Iraq should be qualified as a victory, a draw or a defeat. Though the opinions on this debate vary across the entire range of possibilities, most pundits agree that the truth lies somewhere in the middle and that only time will tell. Success ultimately now depends on the Iraqi people. The ultimate question of whether the U.S. achieved its strategic goals has mixed responses but the U.S. military which withdrew from Iraq, who may debate the issue of whether the Armed Forces should have fought an 8 year war and conducted extensive nation-building operations there, generally feel that they left either victorious or at least as GEN Odierno referred to it, “successful completion of our mission in Iraq.” This paper may allude to victory in Iraq out of interest to succinctly refer to the joint force’s successful conclusion of our mission there but does not seek to enter into the debate of whether Operation Iraqi Freedom should be labeled a categorical success. To be certain, there are a plethora of lessons to be learned both from the U.S. Armed Forces’ successes and failures in Iraq (as well as Afghanistan still ongoing) and this paper attempts to hone in some of those changes appropriate to the institutional Army that should result from those lessons.

⁵ Gates, 2.

⁶ For the purpose of this paper, Iraqi Security Forces or ISF refers to the members of the Iraqi Army, the Iraqi Police, the Federal Police or National Police, and the Directorate of Border Enforcement.

⁷ William Flavin, “Finding the Balance: U.S. Military and Future Operations.” Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, March 2011, 1.

⁸ Frank G. Hoffman, “Striking a Balance: Posturing the Future Force for COIN and Conventional Warfare.” Armed Forces Journal (July 2009), <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2009/07/4099782> (accessed on October 17, 2011), 2.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ In addition, the Army which withdrew from Vietnam in the seventies clearly faced the ominous threat of a peer competitor in conventional military strength found in the Soviet Union. This very real and present threat drove the military of that period to seek to prepare itself for a conventional war in Europe against a numerically far superior conventional enemy by leveraging technological advantages and maneuver warfare to achieve tactical and operational victories. The Army withdrawing from Iraq does not face such an ominous threat that represents such clear existential dangers to the United States in the arena of traditional conventional warfare.

¹² U.S. Department of Defense, *Stability Operations*, DODD 3000.05 (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Defense, November 28, 2005), 2.

¹³ Hoffman, 2.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ For a sample of the extensive debate on the atrophy of core skills, see Colonel Gian Gentile, "Let's Build an Army to Win All Wars," *Joint Forces Quarterly*, (Issue 52, 1st Quarter, 2009), 27-33. Though there has been extensive discussion and lamenting throughout the Army about the erosion of the Army's core competencies and skills in fighting conventional warfare, there have also been many who state that the concern is overstated and that Army leaders from junior to senior level, through the wealth of their experience in combat, are incredibly adept at solving complex problems through innovative and resourceful leadership. What neither side of this dialogue disputes is that the Army's proficiency in conducting major combat operations has eroded as a result of being engaged in stability and reconstruction operations as well as counterinsurgency fighting over the last decade. A thought provoking article on the type of core competencies that have eroded in general purpose forces can be found in *Joint Forces Quarterly* authored by COL Gian Gentile.

¹⁶ For an insight into senior military leaders concerns that drawdowns do not lead to a hollowing of the Army, see GEN Peter Chiarelli, U.S. Army, VCSA Testimony to HASC Subcommittee on Military Readiness, Budget Cuts, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army before the House Armed Services Committee, 112th Cong., 1st sess., October 17, 2011, http://www.army.mil/article/68210/Oct__27__2011___VCSA_testimony_to_HASC_Subcommittee_on_military_readiness__budget_cuts/ (accessed on October 17, 2011). In testimony before the House Armed Services Committee in October 2011, senior leaders across each of the Armed Services acknowledged that the time was right to pursue prudent reductions in Defense spending but implored congressional leaders to bear in mind that the approach must balance reductions in end strength and modernization while maintaining readiness and the all volunteer force. The Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, GEN Pete Chiarelli testified, when asked about the need to reduce end strength and make cuts in the budget, "I would argue from the Army's standpoint that's exactly -- we are participating in the internal debate in the building, but like when I get up in the morning and I see the futures, how they're doing in the stock market, if I had to look around town and read what all the think tanks are saying, they seem to be discounting the requirement for ground forces which is a natural tendency after what we've been through in the last 10 years, but every other time we've done that in our history, as I indicated before, we have done so on the backs of servicemen and women, soldiers on the ground. And quite frankly, let's be honest. It has cost us lives. It cost us lives at Kasserine Pass. It cost us lives at Task Force Smith in Korea. It cost us lives every single time."

¹⁷ Flavin, 3.

¹⁸ Hoffman, 3.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ For reinforcement on the affects to morale and readiness stemming from repeated deployments over many years, see L. J. Korb, "U.S. Ground Forces: Which Way Forward?" *Military Technology*, 31(10), 22-24. Though there are a plethora of newspaper articles, periodicals, and briefings discussing the impact that ten years of war have had on the force's readiness and morale but there are surprisingly few current scholarly articles addressing these issues on the whole of the force. This article however provides a good discussion, albeit a little

dated, on the pace of deployments endured by both the active and the reserve component and how the reality of being deployed, preparing to deploy or recovering from deployment has consumed the attention and focus of the majority of the conventional Army for many years, thus eroding readiness and adversely impacting morale.

²¹ Hoffman, 2.

²² Rand Paul, "The Biggest Threat To Our National Security," *The American Spectator*, September 2011, <http://spectator.org/archives/2011/09/03/the-biggest-threat-to-our-nati> (accessed February 7, 2011).

²³ For insight into the planned priorities and choices being made in the face of budgetary cuts, see Leon E. Panetta, *Department of Defense Strategic Guidance: Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership – Priorities for 21st Century Defense* (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Defense, January 2012). The recently released Defense Budget Priorities and Choices clearly articulates the need to conduct a balanced drawdown of troop end strength while maintaining force readiness and targeted force modernization and recapitulation of an overstretched equipment set. The reality of the budget cuts of \$487 billion over the next decade and the possibility of up to an additional \$600 billion if further cuts are implemented under the Budget Control Act guarantees that the military will be faced with tough choices to make while maintaining the correct priorities for capabilities needed based on the nature of conflict and requirements expected of the Armed Forces in the future.

²⁴ GEN Martin E. Dempsey, "Win, Learn Focus, Adapt, Win Again," *The Cavalry and Armor Journal*, Vol 2, No. 5 (September-October 2011), 7.

²⁵ Hoffman, 4.

²⁶ For a balanced perspective on how defense budgets could affect the economy, see Binyamin Appelbaum, "A Shrinking Military Budget May Take Neighbors With It" *New York Times*, 6 January 2012, accessed online at <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/07/us/a-hidden-cost-of-military-cuts-could-be-invention-and-its-industries.html?pagewanted=all> (accessed on 8 February 2012). There is much debate on Capitol Hill, at the Pentagon and in the press about modernization programs and the defense industrial base in contrast with what programs the government can afford in light of declining budgets. Some have indicated that significant cuts could have an adverse impact on the economy, threatening up to 1 million jobs. An article published in the *New York Times* on 6 January authored by Binyamin Appelbaum, the day after the release of the President's new 2012 Defense Budget Priorities and Choices, portrays several of the differing sides of this debate. "In the political debate over Pentagon cuts, the potential effect on innovation has been largely ignored. Pentagon officials and their allies have instead warned that a sharply smaller military budget would expose the nation to harm, and that such cuts would result in a large and immediate rise in unemployment. Independent economists and analysts say that concern about the short-term economic impact is largely misplaced. While reducing the Pentagon's budget would cause considerable economic pain — some workers would lose their jobs; some contractors would lose their most important customer — research suggests it would be less painful than cutting other kinds of government spending, like education or transportation. A significant portion of the military budget, including the wages of armed forces personnel, is spent abroad. And military spending in this country, like building a new runway at a domestic Air Force base, tends to bring fewer spillover benefits than many other forms of government spending, like a new runway at a commercial airport." Whatever the

actual impact of budget cuts will be on the economy, it is clear that continued deficit spending cannot help speed America's economic recovery. Cuts are necessary with a prudent balance of reduced end strength, sustained efforts to maintain readiness and judicious recapitalization and modernization programs.

²⁷ For details on recent poll data in Egypt, see Brookings Institute, "The 2011 Arab Public Opinion Poll," http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2011/1121_arab_public_opinion_telhami.aspx (accessed January 30, 2012). According to recent polls conducted by the Brookings Institute, since the Arab Spring, 35% of Egyptians want to cancel the peace accords in existence with Israel and 53% believe that the two state peace solutions on the Palestinian issue is no longer on the table and that conflict is inevitable. Only 37% of Egyptians want to maintain the existing peace accords as they stand now.

²⁸ Joint Center for Operational Analysis. *The Comprehensive Approach: An Iraq Case Study* (Norfolk, VA: US Joint Forces Command, February 16, 2010), iii.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Fred Barnes, "How Bush Decided on the Surge," *The Weekly Standard*, Vol 13, No. 20 (4 February 2008). As described by Fred Barnes in his review of the successful shift in counterinsurgency strategy decided on by President George W. Bush, the addition of troops, shift from enemy-centric strategy to population protection centric strategy, and push from small footprint to large footprint strategy contributed to the turning of the corner in Iraq and helped to break the cycle of violence, narrowly averting civil war.

³¹ Joint Center for Operational Analysis. 3.

³² Ibid.

³³ U.S. Department of the Army. *Counterinsurgency*, Field Manual 3-24 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 15, 2006), 1-1.

³⁴ For expansion of the instruments of national power from DIME to DIMEFIL, see The White House, *2006 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism* (Washington DC: September 2006); The White House, *National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism* (Washington DC: February 2006); U.S. Department of the Army, *Counterinsurgency Operations*, Field Manual 3-07.22 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, October 1, 2006). Though the Army's counterinsurgency manual, FM 3-24, limits the discussion of the applicable elements of national power to the DIME convention, several other White House and U.S. Army documents, published around the same time, discuss the importance of integrating the additional three elements of national power: finance, intelligence, and law enforcement. These publications include the 2006 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (NSCT), National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism (NMSP-WOT), and FMI 3-07.22, the interim Army Field Manual for Counterinsurgency. These documents provide good descriptions of these essential elements of national power as an overall component of any counter-terrorism or counterinsurgency strategy.

³⁵ For a good explanation of how the diplomatic instrument of national power relates to counterinsurgency, see U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Operations*, Joint Publication 3-0 (Washington DC: U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, August 11, 2011), V-3, V-10, V-16. The diplomatic

instrument of national power traditionally is the domain of the Department of State and POTUS, however, it is critical that the military professional understands how execution of partnership activities, security cooperation and host nation support can reinforce or detract from strategic goals being pursued through diplomatic initiatives. As documented throughout the military's joint and Army doctrine, military activities are often conducted to secure environments or garner partner nation support for diplomatic efforts that strive to achieve strategic objectives. Joint Pub 3-0 states, "CCDRs and subordinate JFCs must work with US chiefs of mission, Department of State (DOS), and other departments and agencies to best integrate military actions with the diplomatic, economic, and informational instruments of national power in unified action....Sustained presence contributes to deterrence and promotes a secure environment in which diplomatic, economic, and informational programs designed to reduce the causes of instability can perform as designed... The US deploys forces abroad to lend credibility to its promises and commitments, increase its regional influence, and demonstrate its resolve to use military force if necessary. In addition, SecDef orders a show of force to bolster and reassure friends and allies. Show of force operations are military in nature but often serve both diplomatic and military purposes. These operations may influence other governments or politico-military organizations to refrain from belligerent acts."

³⁶ Though much has been written in academic circles on MAWS, for a more detailed discussion on MAWS, see Center for Army Lessons Learned, *Commanders Guide to Money as a Weapon System*, CALL Handbook 09-27 (Ft. Leavenworth, KS: Combined Arms Center, April 2009). There exist innumerable academic papers and articles on the proper use of money as a weapon system. U.S. Army CALL periodicals over the last decade recount numerous success stories and equally abundant failures of misapplication of the economic instrument of national power. CALL Handbook 9-27 published by the Center for Army Lessons Learned at the Combined Arms Center in Fort Leavenworth, KS in April 2009 provides guidelines for the proper implementation of MAWS with countless admonitions on the hazards of the misguided use with detailed examples in OIF and OEF. For a better understanding of MAWS in this modern construct, these documents should be consulted. Military use of economic power to target the root causes of insurgency can be found throughout the history of the Armed Forces. The idea of protecting the population and separating them from the insurgents was applied to economic incentives, revitalization and relocation under the Strategic Hamlet Program in Vietnam but a misunderstanding of how it would be perceived and abuses or corruption within the program ultimately drove much of the rural population away from the Diem government and closer to National Liberation Front (NLF). It is important that economic strategic be closely nested with strategic goals and with a full understanding of the cultural implications of the strategy so that it may have a chance to succeed.

³⁷ For a good explanation of how the financial instrument of national power relates to counter-terrorism and counterinsurgency, see the *2006 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, 17. The NSCT states that "financial systems are used by terrorist organizations as a fiscal sanctuary in which to store and transfer the funds that support their survival and operations. Terrorist organizations use a variety of financial systems, including formal banking, wire transfers, debit and other stored value cards, online value storage and value transfer systems, the informal 'hawala' system, and cash couriers."

³⁸ For a better explanation of how the intelligence instrument of national power relates to counter-terrorism and counterinsurgency, see the *2006 National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism*, 17. The NMSP-WOT states that "Extremist networks require specific and detailed information to achieve their ends. They gather this information from open sources,

human contacts (both witting and unwitting), reconnaissance and surveillance, and technical activities. Terrorists use the resulting intelligence to plan and execute operations, and secure what they need to operate and survive. The intelligence component of extremist networks includes countermeasures to protect against infiltration or attack. Terrorist entities perform counterintelligence, apply operational security measures, use denial and deception, and exercise great care in determining the loyalty and reliability of members, associates, active supporters and other affiliates.”

³⁹ For reinforcement of these concepts in Army doctrine, see U.S. Department of the Army, *Counterinsurgency*, Field Manual 3-24 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 15, 2006) 1-23. FM 3-24 states that “the cornerstone of any COIN effort is establishing security for the civilian populace. Without a secure environment, no permanent reforms can be implemented and disorder spreads. To establish legitimacy, commanders transition security activities from combat operations to law enforcement as quickly as feasible. When insurgents are seen as criminals, they lose public support. Using a legal system established in line with local culture and practices to deal with such criminals enhances the Host Nation government's legitimacy.”

⁴⁰ Captain Justin Gorkowski, “Assessing Acceptable Corruption in Iraq,” Combating Terrorism Center, CTC Sentinel (August 2008, Volume 1, Issue 9) <http://www.ctc.usma.edu/posts/after-action-report-assessing-acceptable-corruption-in-iraq> (accessed February 7, 2011).

⁴¹ David Ucko, “Innovation or Inertia: The U.S. Military and the Learning of Counterinsurgency,” *Orbis*, (Spring 2008), 292.

⁴² Daniel S. Roper, “Preparing the Force for Counterinsurgency, Stability Operations and Security Force Assistance,” *Army*, (December 2009), 62.

⁴³ For a detailed discussion of Bard O'Neill's pioneering work in analysis of insurgencies, see Bard E. O'Neill, *Insurgency and Terrorism: Inside Modern Military Revolutionary Warfare*, (McLean, VA: Brassey's Publishing, 1990), 13-27. O'Neill's methodology follows a distinct seven-step process. The first step describes the nature of insurgency, classifying the type of insurgency involved, identifying its goals, and determining the political resources and military means used by insurgencies in attaining those goals. He continues by describing the form of warfare adopted by the insurgency, whether terrorism, guerilla warfare, or conventional warfare. His second step focuses on determining the strategic approach of the insurgent group, including conspiratorial, protracted popular war, military-focus, or urban warfare strategy. In his third step, he looks at evaluating the environment in terms of its physical (including terrain, climate, and transportation-communication systems) and human (including demography, socioeconomic conditions, and the political culture of the system) components. O'Neill's fourth step transitions from the environmental factors to an analysis of the popular support that insurgencies seek in order to guarantee their success and prop up their legitimacy at the expense of the legitimacy of the government. Fifth, the organization and unity of the insurgency are analyzed to determine the ability of the insurgents “to compensate for the material superiority of their opponents.” Sixth, he analyzes the external support provided to the insurgent group as a key and critical determinant to insurgencies' chances of success. O'Neill asserts, “Unless governments are utterly incompetent . . . insurgent groups normally must obtain outside assistance if they are to succeed.” Finally, step seven analyzes the governmental response in terms of what it can do, what it attempts to do, and how it performs because of the relevance that governmental strategies have on the insurgent group's chances for success and survival.

⁴⁴ Joint Center for Operational Analysis, 4.

⁴⁵ It is critical that leaders at the tactical level consider the second and third-order effects of pursuing tactical level goals to the detriment of strategic level goals. At times, tactical expediency must be sacrificed and greater risk must be assumed in order to achieve strategic objectives. For instance, in Basra in 2010, forces of 1st Combined Arms Battalion, 68th Armor Battalion, much like many of its predecessors since January 1, 2009, had to embrace warrant-based targeting. This in effect required that in order to detain or apprehend suspected terrorists or insurgents, U.S. Forces had to have a legitimate warrant issued by a competent Iraqi authority. Gone were the days of intelligence-based targeting by which U.S. Forces could apprehend suspected insurgents based on typically two source confirmation and at times even single source confirmation of insurgent activity. At first glance, this policy made U.S. Forces more vulnerable as the Iraqi judicial systems were at best horribly bureaucratic and on occasion compromised by pernicious insurgent or Iranian influence. Examples abounded in the Iraqi provincial courts as local Article 4 judges released suspected insurgents with clear ties to threat groups based on feeble explanations of incomplete evidence. Though these “catch and release” programs, as they came to be known, frustrated coalition efforts to disrupt threat groups, the advancement of the strategic goal of developing civil capacity and rule of law were preeminent in the long-term perspective of creating a stable environment with a respect for the competent Iraqi authority. In the end, efforts to explicitly prove Iraqi judicial cooperation with threat groups resulted in actions taken by the Commission on Integrity to purge complicit and corrupt judicial authorities and ISF. These efforts required integrated efforts between civil and military players in Basra and Baghdad and ultimately proved far more valuable to creating long-term stability in Basra than the apprehension of any single detainee or cell. But for the efforts to reshape Army doctrine and ensure that every Soldier and civilian cooperated with a view to long-term stability and strategic objectives, success in Iraq remained improbable or at best short-lived.

⁴⁶ *Counterinsurgency*, Foreword.

⁴⁷ U.S. Department of the Army. *Tactics in Counterinsurgency*, Field Manual 3-24.2 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, March, 2009), 1-4.

⁴⁸ For a better discussion on the civ-mil cooperation at the time of the Surge, see Bradford Baylor, Jeanne Burington, Bradford Davis, and Russell Goehring, “Iraq: A Case Study in Building Civil-Military Capacity, 2007-2010,” *Prism*, vol. 3, no. 1 (25 May 2011): 137. This case study provides an excellent after action review of the cooperative efforts and the leadership of Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus in leading their respective commands to achieve better civil-military cooperation in an effort to achieve unity of effort.

⁴⁹ Edward Marks, “Rethinking the Geographic Combatant Commands,” *InterAgency Journal*, Vol. 1 Issue 1 (Fall 2010): 20.

⁵⁰ For a discussion of some of the challenges faced in trying to synchronize the manning, equipping and training cycles in the ARFORGEN process, see Major Brandon Grubbs, Major Bill Haas, and Lieutenant Colonel Robert Reynolds, “Ready, Set, Redeploy,” *Army Logistician*, (1 March 2008), 32. In practice, though the ARFORGEN process was developed to help units prepare for combat, making a deliberate shift from tiered readiness, the ARFORGEN process was not without its challenges. It was the personal experience of the author of this paper that though equipping and training cycles were often set up well for units preparing to redeploy to

theater with short reset periods often ranging between as little as 10 to 15 months, the manning cycles were frequently out of synch, leaving units struggling to achieve better than 80 percent strength by the time their mission readiness rehearsal occurred mere months before deploying to theater.

⁵¹ Though expensive in initial cost outlays, the savings achieved over the long run through the development and use of simulations technology for company combined arms maneuver training achieved through use of the Close Combat Tactical Trainer (CCTT) were significant. The ability to take a company/team of armor and infantry, mounted and dismounted, with other combat multipliers such as artillery and aviation in the simulator saved the Army millions in costs to achieve comparable training in maneuver areas with live training. Such simulations could be developed to better replicate any COIN environments in any number of locations worldwide. The Army is already pursuing such efforts but must not let these efforts fall to budgetary cuts.

⁵² An excellent analysis on this subject can be found in Brigadier General Jeffery Buchanan, Captain Maxie Y. Davis, and Colonel Lee Wright, "Death of the Combatant Command? Toward a Joint Interagency Approach," *Joint Forces Quarterly*, (Issue 52, 1st Quarter, 2009): 92-96. As elaborated in their article, these JIACOMs would be headed by highly-credentialed senior civilian experts from either academic or Foreign Service fields who would hold at least an equivalency in rank to the four star forces commander that would represent DoD concerns and authority. This construct could facilitate the integration on a full-time basis all of the federal agencies with roles in each region such as Department of State, Homeland Security, Treasury, USAID, Agriculture, Public Diplomacy, Justice and the national intelligence apparatus thus better facilitating civil-military integrated approaches.

⁵³ Center for Army Lessons Learned, *Afghanistan Provincial Reconstruction Handbook*, CALL Handbook 11-16 (Ft. Leavenworth, KS: Combined Arms Center, February 2011), 40-41.

⁵⁴ For a sample of the type of virtual training in replicating civilians on the battlefield already underway at Fort Wainwright, see Sheryl Nix, "Virtual Battle Space, Realistic Training," http://www.usarak.army.mil/main/Stories_Archives/Sep27-Oct1/100927_FS4.asp (accessed February 9, 2012). Though this article only touches on the tip of the iceberg in potential training benefits and cost savings of developing better virtual reality civilians on the battlefield training simulators, it is clear that much could be done in this area with existing and developing technology to expand future capabilities that could better enable the regionally aligned brigades to become better prepared for possible contingency operations.

⁵⁵ U.S. Department of State, *Civilian Response Corps: Message from the Coordinator*, <http://www.civilianresponsecorps.gov/who/message/index.htm> (accessed November 30, 2011).

⁵⁶ For one perspective on the value of adding MRAPs to the MTO&E, see MAJ Everett Lacroix, "Adding MRAPs to Transportation Companies," *Professional Bulletin of United States Army Sustainment*, vol. 43, iss. 5 (September – October 2011) http://www.almc.army.mil/alog/issues/SepOct11/Adding_MRAP_Transportatin_Companieshtml.html (accessed February 9, 2011). Though it is improbable that maneuver units will be able to operate and maintain dual fleets, some MRAPs added to all units in order to remain proficient in this valuable platform is prudent, whereas some units such as the transportation companies alluded to in this article could replace some heavy trucks currently in their MTO&E with MRAPs. All other MRAPs redeployed to the United States should be centrally controlled, maintained and secured for

future use when needed in future conflicts, in a similar fashion as the Army Prepositioned Stocks fleets maintained worldwide.

⁵⁷ Michael A. Vane, "Adapting the Generating Force," *Military Review*, (Vol. 90, Issue 1): 33.

⁵⁸ The fielded forces deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan struggled to prepare for the materiel that would be provided to them in theater as a result of the absence of the equipment or need to train on the numerous variants of MRAP platforms which were fielded to the Army in response to increased lethality of EFPs. Likewise, in some cases, stove-piping of the purchase of C2 systems by different segments of the Army caused significant conflicts or even total lack of interoperability of these systems in combat, stymieing efforts to work cooperatively for a true common operating picture. In addition, purchase of CREW technology by the Army and Warlock Duke technology by the Marine Corps actually resulted in degradation of both forces jamming technology as these systems were not only different but in some cases negated the effectiveness of RCIED jamming when operating in close proximity to each other.

⁵⁹ Vane, 34.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 36.

⁶¹ "Levin, McCain Introduce Defense Reform Bill," *Aerospace Daily and Defense Report* (25 February 2009) 1.

⁶² Vane, 36.

⁶³ Ibid, 37.

⁶⁴ For a comprehensive summary on Army modernization in a fiscally austere environment, see LTG Robert P. Lennox, "Army Modernization Plan 2012," U.S. Department of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff, G8 (Washington DC, U.S. Department of the Army, May 24, 2011) <http://www.bctmod.army.mil/news/pdf/Army%20Modernization%20Plan%202012.pdf> (accessed on February 9, 2012). This document sets forth the strategy for modernization in the executive summary, "The Army Modernization Plan 2012 incorporates lessons learned from almost a decade of conflict and provides details of what is required to develop, field and sustain equipment in an affordable, incremental manner. Through its core competencies of combined arms maneuver and wide area security, the Army must continue to enable the United States to prevent and deter conflict, prepare to defeat adversaries in future contingencies, prevail in conflicts that arise and preserve and enhance the all volunteer force. Today we are faced with uncertain strategic and operational environments coupled with declining economic predictions. The Army's modernization strategy and modernization plan reflect these uncertainties and are nested with the Army strategy of rotational readiness. The Army uses the Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) model to build a versatile mix of tailorable and networked organizations operating on a rotational cycle to provide a sustained flow of trained, equipped and ready forces at a tempo that is predictable and sustainable. The FY12 equipment budget request reflects the Army's priority materiel programs and highlights the critical capabilities we need to give our Soldiers and units the decisive edge in full-spectrum operations. These strategy-based equipment priorities are needed to (1) Network the Force; (2) Deter and Defeat hybrid threats; and (3) Protect and Empower Soldiers. While preparing the FY12 President's Budget Request, the Army made difficult decisions to not resource promising and needed technologies and capabilities that did not fit within current and projected resource limitations."

⁶⁵ For a thorough discussion on leadership and officership, see Brian M. Burton, Dr. John A. Nagl, Dr. Don M. Snider, Frank G. Hoffman, Captain Mark R. Hagerott, and Colonel Roderick C. Zastrow, “Keeping the Edge: Revitalizing America’s Military Officer Corps,” *Center for New American Security*, February, 2010, 16. In recent years, there have been countless scholarly works and analyses on the importance of developing critically thinking, agile and adaptive leaders for the Armed Forces, particularly the Army, based on the benefits of such strengths experienced over the last decade in the very complex environments in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as because of the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous environments in which the military is likely to operate in the future. One of the best discussions on the kind of adaptive and agile leaders that the Army needs to develop in the future can be found in this CNAS study published in February 2010 and entitled, “Keeping the Edge: Revitalizing America’s Military Officer Corps.” Consider the following excerpt: “To respond effectively to these complex international and domestic challenges, the U.S. military must develop and maintain a high degree of adaptability within the officer corps. Twenty-first century military officers must learn and embody enduring principles of warfare and leadership, but the teaching and training of officers must change to meet the contemporary demands and opportunities they are likely to face. In addition to demonstrating a high degree of proficiency in conventional state-on-state warfare, officers must also develop a broader skill set in politics, economics, and the use of information in modern warfare to cope with a more complicated and rapidly evolving international environment. Determining the proper balance between conventional competencies and emerging requirements—and the best means to train and educate a corps of adaptive leaders—remains a contentious issue with no obvious consensus solution.” Describing the chapters of the study and how each addresses the need for development of the officer corps in the Army, the text continues saying, “Each author approaches future officer development in a different way, but all arrive at similar, though not identical, conclusions regarding the importance of providing a broader range of educational and professional experiences—essential components of training agile minds how to think rather than what to think—and cultivating new skill sets that are more relevant to the contemporary strategic environment. Dr. Don M. Snider, an expert on military professionalism at the U.S. Army War College, emphasizes the importance of cultivating the officer corps as an expert profession which requires the possession of specialized knowledge on the use of military force. Thus, personnel policy, training, and education must preserve core professional competencies, but also develop a progressively deeper understanding of war and strategy. Frank Hoffman establishes a framework for how to think about the requirements for officership in a rapidly changing threat environment marked by ‘complex irregular warfare’ or ‘hybrid war.’ He identifies six primary ‘leadership lines of operation’ that must be pursued in order to reach a ‘full-spectrum profession’ of military officership: professional rigor, operational focus, ethical sensitivity, situational intelligence, orientation to national rather than parochial needs, and continuous learning. This framework is useful in highlighting an overall strategy to achieve the goal of an officer corps that can adapt to changing circumstances while maintaining core competencies.” There is much more in this text but these two chapters complement the recommendations found in this paper. Anyone seeking to understand current thought on how to promote agility and adaptability in the Army officer corps would do well to read this seminal text.

⁶⁶ Vane, 34.

⁶⁷ Ucko, 301.

⁶⁸ Office of Management and Budget, “Outlays by Function and Subfunction: 1962-2016” <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Historicals> (accessed December 5, 2011).

⁶⁹ For details of President Barak Obama, Secretary Leon Panetta and GEN Martin Dempsey's press conference on the defense strategy given on 5 January 2011, see Lisa Daniel, "Guidance Guards Against All Threats Officials Say", January 5, 2012 <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=66688> (accessed on January 30, 2012); GEN Raymond T. Odierno, "Budget Impact to the Army Briefing at the Pentagon," in a press conference on the impacts to the Army from budget cuts given on 27 January 2012, accessed online at <http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4964> (accessed on 8 February, 2012) More detailed numbers and strategies for how this end strength reduction applies to the U.S. Army were elaborated on by Chief of Staff of the Army, GEN Raymond Odierno on 27 January. Emphasizing responsible and balanced approaches to drawdown, GEN Odierno stated, "Over the last five years, we grew the Army to meet the requirements associated with large-scale combat and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. With the successful completion of our mission in Iraq, the continued transition of operations to Afghan security forces and the reduction of U.S. presence in Afghanistan, our strategy calls for us to no longer plan for large-scale stability operations. Accordingly, the time is strategically right to reduce the Army's force structure. Even given a fiscally constrained environment, our Army will accomplish our reductions in a responsible and controlled manner. Secretary McHugh and I are committed to ensuring we walk down this hill at the ready rather than running our nation's Army off a cliff. We will reduce our active force end strength from 570,000 to 490,000, which will include a reduction of at least eight brigade combat teams. It is important to note, however, that an Army of 490,000 in 2017 will be fundamentally different and more capable than the Army of 482,000 that we had in 2001."

⁷⁰ David Alexander and Jim Wolf, "Military Budget Cuts: Pentagon Unveils 2013 Plan," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/01/26/military-budget-cuts-pentagon_n_1234761.html (accessed on February 7, 2012).

⁷¹ Odierno. In keeping with the consistent theme in public speaking engagements, the Army Chief of Staff emphasized that the drawdown in forces had to be balanced and controlled. In his statement to the press on 27 January 2012 on the subject of the impact of budget cuts on the Army posture, he stated, "Our approach to the current future budget cycles will remain strategy-based and fiscally prudent. Adjustments will come through deliberately balancing three rheostats: the first piece consisting of an end-strength force structure and personnel; second, modernization; and third, readiness." No matter what the changes to force structure are, senior Army leadership agrees that the Army must remain a capable force to do our nation's bidding. GEN Odierno went on to say, "We prevent conflict. We do this by maintaining credibility based on the Army capacity, its readiness and modernization to prevent miscalculation by potential adversaries. Moreover, the Army has a critical role in shaping the environment by supporting Combatant Commanders and sustaining strong military relations with allies, building the capacity of partners to maintain internal and regional stability and operating alongside our joint forces to facilitate access around the world. And we stand ready to win our nation's wars when needed. If all else fails, the Army will always be ready to rapidly apply its combined arms capabilities to dominate any environment and win decisively as part of the Joint Force. As we look ahead, the Secretary and I have several priorities. Foremost, we will provide trained, equipped and ready forces to win the current fight. Second, we will develop the Army for the future as part of Joint Force 2020, a versatile mix of capabilities, formations and equipment. We must sustain our high-quality, all-volunteer Army."

⁷² Office of Management and Budget, "Outlays by Function and Subfunction: 1962-2016" <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Historicals> (accessed December 5, 2011).

